

# AECOM

## Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan Consultation Report

AECOM – the independent agency who has managed and analysed the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan consultation responses

15<sup>th</sup> June 2021

## Quality information

Prepared by	Checked by	Verified by	Approved by
Hannah Dodd Consultant Neil Rogers Principal Research Consultant Jodie Knight Principal Research Consultant	Neil Rogers Principal Research Consultant	Tamsin Stuart Regional Director	Frank Mohan Regional Director

## Revision History

Revision	Revision date	Details	Authorized	Position
2.0	05.02.21	Revised following comments from TfGM 22.01.21	Tamsin Stuart	Regional Director
3.0	04.03.21	Revised following comments from TfGM 11.02.21	Tamsin Stuart	Regional Director
4.0	09.05.21	Revised following comments from TfGM 05.05.21	Tamsin Stuart	Regional Director
5.0	24.05.21	Revised following comments from TfGM 21.05.21	Tamsin Stuart	Regional Director
6.0	15.06.21	Revised following comments from TfGM 08.06.21	Tamsin Stuart	Regional Director

## Distribution List

# Hard Copies	PDF Required	Association / Company Name

Prepared for:

Transport for Greater Manchester and the 10 Greater Manchester Local Authorities

Prepared by:

Neil Rogers  
Principal Research Consultant  
T: 0161 927 8373  
E: neil.rogers@aecom.com

AECOM Limited  
1New York Street  
Manchester  
M1 4HD  
United Kingdom

T: +44(0)161 601 1700  
aecom.com

© 2021 AECOM Limited. All Rights Reserved.


This document has been prepared by AECOM Limited ("AECOM") for sole use of our client (the "Client") in accordance with generally accepted consultancy principles, the budget for fees and the terms of reference agreed between AECOM and the Client. Any information provided by third parties and referred to herein has not been checked or verified by AECOM, unless otherwise expressly stated in the document. No third party may rely upon this document without the prior and express written agreement of AECOM.

# Executive Summary

## Introduction

As set out in the Consultation document, the Secretary of State has instructed many local authorities across the UK to take quick action to reduce harmful Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) levels, issuing a direction under the Environment Act 1995 to undertake feasibility studies to identify measures for reducing NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations to within legal limit values in the “shortest possible time”. In Greater Manchester, the 10 Local Authorities, the Greater Manchester Combined Authority (GMCA) and Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM), collectively referred to as “Greater Manchester” or “GM”, have worked together to develop a Clean Air Plan to tackle NO<sub>2</sub> Exceedances at the Roadside, referred to as GM CAP.

## Summary of the Proposed Clean Air Plan



## Consultation

A consultation took place between Thursday 8 October and Thursday 3 December (running for 8 weeks in total). A total of 4,768 responses were captured via:

- Online questionnaire (3,954 responses);
- Paper questionnaire (43 responses);
- Email (770 responses); and
- Telephone (1 response).



Respondents have been grouped as follows:

Respondent type	Description	Number of responses*
General public	A personal response by an individual, the report will also refer to as the public and members of the public	3,858
Businesses	A response on behalf of a business, including anyone who is self-employed and / or a sole trader and includes taxi owners, drivers and operators	784
Representatives	An organisation** or a councillor / elected official	124

\*Two respondents did not provide an answer to the respondent type

\*\*An organisation includes but is not limited to schools, charities, social enterprise, trade organisations, government bodies

The consultation was subject to two campaigns; a large volume of identical responses were received by email:

- 172 emails were received from one group; the Environmental Bill Lobby; and
- 484 were received from the CAZ support group.

The Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) conducted its own survey about the Clean Air Plan and shared its results.

The British Horse Society and the Horse and Hounds advertised the Clean Air Plan amongst its followers, which resulted in a higher than expected response from those with private leisure vehicles.

Of those responding to the survey 77% of businesses and 17% of the public had one or more vehicles that could be affected by the introduction of the CAZ.

## Boundary

Just over a third of the public and representatives and a quarter of businesses provided a comment about the boundary. Responses were very polarised; a third of the public and half of representatives provided a positive comment whereas half of businesses raised concerns. The most frequently mentioned comments included:

Support	Concerns	Suggested amendments
Agree with the boundary	Area is too big	City centre should be an Ultra-Low Emission Zone
Include the SRN / other strategic roads	Negative impact on those based on the GM boundary	Boundary should focus on city centre
Make the zone larger		Just those areas with poor air quality
<p><i>"It should include Motorways - need to lobby highways to include M56, M60, M62 and M602." (Public)</i></p> <p><i>"It's too large an area and the problem area are clearly in the built-up conurbations. If this has to be implemented, then it should be far more targeted at areas with specific high pollution issues not a blanket rule across the whole of GM much of which does not have a problem with traffic-based pollution" (Business, with LGV)</i></p> <p><i>"Far too large, should restrict to Manchester City Centre." (Public)</i></p> <p><i>"I think it's correct that it doesn't cover just the city centre area. There are high population densities throughout the area highlighted, which all need protecting." (Public)</i></p>		
<p><b>Representatives:</b> Concerns were raised by neighbouring authorities about the impact on those based in neighbouring authorities. Issues included: business relocating non-compliant vehicles to neighbouring areas and therefore moving the problem on; increased rat-running, as drivers try and avoid the charge; and congestion, as vehicles re-route. Concerns were also raised for businesses based just outside the boundary who would be subject to the charge but would not benefit from the funding offers.</p>		

## Hours of operation

Around a third of the public and representatives and a sixth of businesses provided a comment about the hours of operation. Over half of the public and representatives, who provided a comment generally supported the operation times, whereas two thirds of businesses suggested amendments to the operation times.

Support	Concerns	Suggested amendments
<p>Support the proposed operation times</p> <div style="border: 2px solid #92d050; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p><i>“Delighted that it will be 24 / 7 to avoid time shifting of vehicle use / deliveries if operation did not include the night hours.” (Public)</i></p> </div> <div style="border: 2px solid #92d050; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p><i>“Pollution doesn’t operate by a clock” (Public)</i></p> </div>	<p>Generally against</p> <div style="border: 2px solid #f4a460; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p><i>“Not really a clean air zone then! congestion charge because why is it going to run 24/7 when (NO<sub>2</sub>) levels will be within the legal limits at certain times. (Business with hackney carriage)</i></p> </div>	<p>Do not charge for evening / night-time journeys</p> <p>Only charge peak time journeys</p> <p>Do not charge weekend travel</p> <p>Only charge once in a 24-hour period</p> <div style="border: 2px solid #00a0e3; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p><i>“24 hours a day seems a lot given the pollution levels would be highest at peak times (7-10am, 3-7pm)” (Public)</i></p> </div> <div style="border: 2px solid #00a0e3; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p><i>“We support the 24/7 nature of these proposals. We would urge Greater Manchester to ensure that only one payment occurs per rolling 24-hour period....to avoid...double charges for a single journey. This is particularly an issue for the night-time economy, and for businesses such as the airport that are used overnight.” (Business owns bus and LGV)</i></p> </div>
<p><b>Representatives and stakeholders</b> made suggestions to amend the proposed midnight to midnight timing for a daily charge:</p> <p><i>“We believe a midnight to midnight ‘charging day’ would disproportionately impact taxi and private hire vehicles... As an alternative, we believe the Clean Air Zone ‘charging day should apply from 4am-4am.” (Business, Private Hire Operator)</i></p>		

## Charges and Exemptions

Non-compliant vehicles would be subject to the following daily charge		
£7.50	£10.00	£60.00
Hackney carriages	Minibuses	Buses / Coaches
Private hire vehicles	Vans	HGVs

Whilst there will be some exemptions granted for certain types of vehicle, those with non-compliant vehicles who do not pay the daily charge will be liable to receive a proposed Penalty Charge Notice (PCN) of £120 per day.

The table below shows the proportion of respondents feeling the daily charge for each type of vehicle is too much, too little or about right (some respondents did not know which is not shown in the table). It also includes the most frequently mentioned comments given by respondents to explain the reason for their score.

- Views on the proposed daily charge vary, businesses felt charges for all vehicles are too much and the public felt the charges are about right or too little;
- Typically, 40% of the public felt charges for each type of vehicle type were too much and 50% felt the charges were either about right or too little;
- Bus charges were the exception for the general public: 52% felt they were too much and 38% about right or too little. Those aged under 35 felt the bus charge was too little or about right and those aged over 45 that it is too much.

	Public (%)	Business (%)	Representatives (%)	Main comments	
<b>Bus</b>	Too much	52	72	35	Buses take traffic off the road due to less personal vehicle traffic Concern charges will be passed on
	About right / too little	39	19	56	Support the charges – are polluting vehicles
<b>Coach</b>	Too much	43	70	28	Cannot afford the charge Will impact tourism / GM economy
	About right / too little	48	21	61	Support the charges – are polluting vehicles
<b>HGV</b>	Too much	40	74	29	Business already runs on tight margins
	About right / too little	53	19	62	Large companies can afford the charges
<b>LGV</b>	Too much	40	75	37	Will impact small business
	About right / too little	54	21	58	Not enough to promote change
<b>Minibus</b>	Too much	38	71	33	Carry more passengers than a car or van
	About right / too little	55	22	59	No comments provided
<b>Hackney carriage</b>	Too much	40	73	31	Cannot afford charge Will cause drivers to leave
	About right / too little	52	21	61	They're always on the go
<b>Private hire</b>	Too much	41	73	34	Cannot afford charge
	About right / too little	53	23	56	Do a significant number of miles

### Views from public and representatives in favour

Client Earth	<i>For the Councils' CAZ scheme to be effective at reducing illegal levels of pollution, quickly, the applicable charges must be set a level that deters the use of the most polluting vehicles. This is essential if the Councils' plans are to work to protect people's health and comply with legal requirements to tackle illegal levels of NO<sub>2</sub> pollution in the shortest possible time.</i>
Public	<i>"Not enough. Should be about 100 times higher. Disgraceful that you aren't charging private cars."  "The charges should be as high as possible to deter going in the area. Health &amp; climate change are two of the most critical issues of our time. Private cars should definitely be included as well."</i>

### Views from vehicle owners against

Bus	<i>"Buses &amp; coaches should have a cheaper charge as they significantly reduce traffic on the roads, cars should have a much higher cost."</i>
Coach	<i>"You've not got the £60 / day in your contract to just lose, we just haven't got it. We're not being pathetic and just saying it, it's actually true."</i>
HGV	<i>"I think these charges are ridiculous. Living inside the boundary means I'm going to have to find £70 a day before I even turn a wheel (60 for my truck and 10 for my van). That's £350 if I work 5 days. How can I pass this on to my customers?"</i>
HGV Leisure vehicle	<i>"The charge means I just won't go into the region. I won't attend some of the riding schools there and I now won't go to the garage that I have gone to for years because he is in Urmston so I would be charged."</i>
LGV	<i>"Well, somebody who's a small builder or has their own small business, that's £50 a week in that van, that's £250 a month on top of your road tax and all the other taxes."</i>
Minibus	<i>"Why on earth would you charge buses and minibuses who reduce the need for cars on the road and reduce the overall emissions by carrying lots of people at once."</i>
Hackney carriage	<i>"That's extortion to be honest how on earth hard working drivers will be able to pay these ridiculous charges when it's hard to put food on table and paying bills. When overheads are already suffocating Hackney trade and no means of fair competition this would be last nail in coffin for sure"</i>
Private hire	<i>"The charges for taxi are high, due to the business inflation It is not possible to afford £7.50 a day. Sometimes we are not able to make £20 for whole day and pay 7.50 for clean air, what is left for us."</i>

## Exemptions and discounts

Permanent local exemptions	Temporary local exemptions	Permanent local discounts
Greater Manchester are proposing permanent local exemptions for Clean Air Zone charges for specialist vehicles, vehicles entering Greater Manchester due to a road diversion on the motorway network and vehicles used for the purposes of a disabled person which are exempt from vehicle tax.	Greater Manchester are proposing temporary local exemptions from Clean Air Zone charges until 31 December 2022 to give certain vehicles more time to upgrade due to cost / supply of a compliant vehicle and to lessen impacts considered outside of the control of the vehicle owner, these include wheelchair accessible hackney / private hire vehicles, and vans.	Greater Manchester are proposing permanent local discounts for Clean Air Zone charges for private hire vehicles licensed to one of the 10 Greater Manchester Local Authorities and also used as a private car, and leisure vehicles greater than 3.5 tonnes in private ownership.
<b>Agree:</b> 68% of the public, 55% of businesses and 77% of representatives	<b>Agree:</b> 64% of the public, 54% of businesses and 67% of representatives	<b>Agree:</b> 44% of the public, 46% of businesses and 57% of representatives
<i>"It is unfair to charge a vehicle a daily rate if they had no other option than to travel in the payment zone due to a diversion." (Public)</i>	<i>"I don't think the extension is long enough, I calculate that I would need to find £200,000 to upgrade my fleet to avoid charges. This is impossible in two years. This extension should be a 3 year minimum to give business a chance to respond" (Business, LGV)</i>	<i>"We regularly use ours (vehicle) for personal use, so would make it difficult to choose whether to taxi or have a family car if we couldn't do both due to having to pay the charge on days we weren't utilising the taxi as a taxi" (Business, PHV)</i>
<b>Concerns about the exemption:</b>		
<i>"Permanent exemption means there is no incentive for these vehicles to be compliant, ever. Community minibuses - fair enough that these are given time to comply but an open ended exemption is putting polluting vehicles into the centre of communities, e.g. travelling to schools" (Public)</i>	<i>"We need to reduce the impact of these vehicles urgently, not in 2 years time so whenever the deadline, they are likely to wait as long as they can before upgrading / replacing. Let people know about it now through promotions and set the deadline as December 2021" (Public)</i>	<i>"All private hire vehicle owners will simply claim their vehicle is used as a private car and therefore claim the exemption. This would make the charge on private hire vehicles pointless." (Public)</i>
<b>Suggested additional exemptions:</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Private leisure vehicles (e.g. horsebox, motorhome)</li> <li>Vehicles used by disabled / vulnerable users</li> <li>Buses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specialist vehicles and those used by disabled</li> <li>Taxis and private hire vehicles</li> <li>Private leisure vehicles (e.g. horsebox, motorhome)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Located outside GM but operate within</li> <li>Leisure vehicles</li> <li>More vehicles / affected people (general)</li> </ul>

## Funding

Clean Bus Fund	Clean Commercial Fund	Clean Taxi Fund
Greater Manchester are proposing financial support to help operators who are registered in Greater Manchester and run a registered bus service in Greater Manchester.	Greater Manchester are proposing financial support to help smaller local business, sole traders, Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) organisations and private individuals upgrade vans and HGVs, minibuses and coaches, to cleaner more compliant vehicles.	Greater Manchester are proposing financial support to help upgrade hackney carriages / private hire vehicles licensed to one of the 10 Greater Manchester Local Authorities to cleaner compliant vehicles.
<p><b>Support for the funds:</b> There was high level of support for the funds amongst all respondent types and many felt it was needed in order to help business upgrade:</p>		
<p><i>“I welcome this idea [bus fund] and think that as much support as possible should be directed towards supporting public transport operators to reduce the financial impact of the changes.” (Public)</i></p>	<p><i>“Supporting them is the only way they will be able to switch vehicles. If you want the scheme to be successful you must give them support.” (Councillor / Elected Official)</i></p>	<p><i>“I know cabbies don't make a huge living, so there needs to be grants and incentives to support the transition into new vehicles as opposed to letting them opt out if they say they cannot pay.” (Public)</i></p>
<p><b>Concerns about the funds and their management:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Higher funding amount: many comments were received stating the proposed amounts are not enough</li> <li>• However, there were some concerns amongst the public that public money should not be used to fund private enterprise and businesses should find the funds themselves</li> <li>• There were some concerns about mismanagement of the funds and people taking advantage of the scheme</li> <li>• Concerns were raised for those that are based just outside of the boundary and several comments were made that funding should be available to them</li> </ul>		

## Clean Bus Fund

The number of bus operators in Greater Manchester is comparatively low to the number of HGV and LGV drivers, therefore the number who responded to the consultation was relatively low.


*“We welcome the aim of the Fund and understand the management and distribution. We do however recognise the shortfall against the initial ask and have some concern that there may be a shortfall in the number of compliant vehicles at the time the charging is introduced. There could also be delays in supplies of the necessary kit which may lead to installations being delayed or suspended.” (Arriva)*

*“The grant limit for both bus and coach of £16,000 per vehicle is not a true reflection of the cost of retrofit and we understand it was based on average cost, setting a higher limit would be fair and equitable.” (CPT)*



## Clean Commercial Fund

The figure below shows the number of respondents with an affected vehicle, whether they thought they would be eligible for funding and if so, did that funding meet their needs. Most did not feel the funding meets their needs.



Caution small numbers.

## Main reasons funds do not meet their needs


	Funding amount is not enough	Cannot easily replace vehicles	Cannot afford to upgrade
<b>HGV</b>	<i>"The cost of replacing the vehicles would leave me with a financial short fall of £35,500 for a second hand or £90,000 for brand new. 'Up to' £4500 is nowhere near enough."</i>	<i>"Insurance for electric commercial vehicles is a significant problem, there is only one insurer prepared to offer cover and it is exorbitant. This failure of the insurance market needs to be taken up by the Govt."</i>	<i>"the replacement vehicle we purchased last year ... cost just under a quarter of a million pounds to replace one vehicle. ... it does have quite a knock-on effect with obviously profit margins"</i>
<b>Leisure</b>	<i>"I would need help in meeting the additional costs brought on directly or indirectly by this action"</i>	<i>"Funding won't go far enough. Not with specialist vehicles, because to me a horsebox is a specialist vehicle, you know, it's not just a box, you know, there's a lot of things that go into making that safe to transport up to three half ton animals at the end of the day."</i>	<i>"the second-hand value of [my] vehicle and the likely replacement cost of a compliant vehicle there is a significant gap. This is without taking into account that the proposals may lead to a drop-in value of non-compliant vehicles and an increase in cost (due to supply issues) of compliant vehicles."</i>
<b>LGV / Van owner</b>	<i>"£3.5k to purchase a new van. Have you tried purchasing a used LGV before, as this goes no way near the cost involved. My business can't afford or justify the purchase of a much newer vehicle."</i>	<i>"it still requires too much investment from the business, our vehicles are not just vehicles, the have to have custom made fittings in the cargo area which can also run up to £3000-£4000 on top of the price of the vehicle"</i>	<i>"The money you are suggested is available is about 1/3 the cost of a new van. Selling my current vehicle would raise another couple of grand but to expect me to pay out £6000 of my own money in the next couple of years with the current loss of revenue is wrong".</i>



	Funding amount is not enough	Cannot easily replace vehicles	Cannot afford to upgrade
<b>Coach / minibus</b>	<i>"It's £5,000 towards a minibus and to get a Euro 6 even a Ford Transit you're looking at about £27,000 so £5,000 towards that is another £21,000 per vehicle times three, so it's a big debt that you're getting yourself into for the sake of earning not enough."</i>	<i>No comments</i>	<i>a Euro 6 coach is £250,000, we have fourteen vehicles, that would be over £3 Million pounds and our annual turnover is £450,000, so you tell me how we're supposed to do that?"</i>

## Clean Taxi Fund

The figure to the right shows the number of respondents with an affected vehicle, whether they thought they would be eligible for funding and if so, did that funding meet their needs. Most did not feel the proposed level of funding meets their needs.



Caution small numbers.

## Main reasons proposed funds do not meet their needs

	Funding amount is not enough	Decrease in value of current vehicle due to proposals	Cannot afford to upgrade
<b>Hackney carriage</b>	<i>"To replace my vehicle with a CAZ compliant one at the present time would cost me £25000. To go fully electric without taking a drop in the standard of my vehicle would cost £60000. Offering £5 -10K doesn't cut it."</i>	<i>"the fact that my vehicle is Euro5 means that it's trade in value has been heavily reduced by the CAZ plans meaning its even less likely that I will be able to upgrade to a compliant vehicle"</i>	<i>"I've struggled for the past 3 years to pay finance on a 25k loan, which I took out to upgrade my vehicle in the hope it would be a long time investment. Now your [sic] asking me to ditch my vehicle and take out another loan for 40k"</i>
<b>Private hire vehicle</b>	<i>"If the Government allows a less then [sic] 5 year old private hire car then they should support more because £1000 for private hire is nothing. New cars are very expensive. No one can afford by himself".</i>	<i>No Comment</i>	<i>"Because I would still need to go into more debt than I am already in and it will push me nearer to the edge that I am already teetering on."</i>

## Try Before You Buy

To tackle the barriers to switching to electric vehicles (EV), GM is proposing a “Try Before You Buy” initiative for GM-licensed hackney drivers.

Support	Concern
<p><b>Understanding:</b> will help drivers get a better idea of vehicles and capabilities</p> <p><b>Overcome anxieties</b> surrounding electric vehicle technology and encourage more drivers to convert to electric</p> <p><b>Extend to other vehicles:</b> such as PHV and LGVs</p>	<p><b>Unnecessary:</b> if hackney drivers are going to upgrade to EV anyway</p> <p><b>Lack of EV infrastructure:</b> and when to charge vehicles if they are in use 24 hours</p> <p><b>Performance of EV</b> and battery life</p> <p><b>Cost of EV:</b> unaffordable for some</p>
<div style="border: 2px solid #76b82a; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p><i>“I would be interested in the try before you buy scheme.”</i> (Business, Hackney)</p> </div> <div style="border: 2px solid #76b82a; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p><i>“Great idea. an equivalent for vans would be even better, as there are many more of these impacted.”</i> (Public)</p> </div>	<div style="border: 2px solid #e67e22; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p><i>“It’s not the trying the vehicle it’s the amount it is to buy one”</i> (Business, Hackney)</p> </div> <div style="border: 2px solid #e67e22; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px;"> <p><i>“I know a two-year-old electric car, it needs batteries already and it’s costing .... £1200.”</i> (Business, Hackney)</p> </div>
<p><b>Representatives commented:</b></p> <p><i>“Members feel that this is a good idea if it sits within a comprehensive package of measures. There’s no point in it if the electric option is financially non-viable, as it is currently is under the suggested proposals.”</i> (Unite the Union)</p>	

## Impact of Covid-19

76% of businesses and 79% of taxis stated they had been financially impacted by Covid-19.

Financial effect	Level of debt increased	Reserves / Savings reduced	Turnover lower	Profitability lower
Business	60%	75%	89%	84%
Taxi	71%	65%	82%	81%
Organisation	63%	67%	83%	71%

Base: all respondents financially impacted by Covid-19

### Main comments received about the impact of Covid-19

Impact on Business	Impact on Air Quality	Timings of the CAP
<p><b>Increased financial pressure:</b> many had lost significant amounts of income and an uncertain future made business unable to invest</p>	<p><b>Highlighted the need to improve air quality:</b> experiencing better air quality had enabled people to see the difference in air quality. Its highlighted air quality does impact health conditions</p>	<p><b>Shouldn't be delayed:</b> those without an impacted vehicle felt the proposals should not be delayed as clean air is important</p>
<p><b>Cannot afford to upgrade vehicles:</b> many stated any savings had been used and felt their credit rating had decreased</p>	<p><b>Has resulted in improved air quality</b> and will continue to do so as more people continue to work at home</p>	<p><b>Should be delayed:</b> Businesses felt the proposals should be delayed giving them time to recover financially</p>
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div style="width: 30%; border: 1px solid orange; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p><i>"If you introduce this then we are closing the business." (Business, LGV)</i></p> </div> <div style="width: 30%; border: 1px solid green; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px; margin-bottom: 10px;"> <p><i>"clean air/our health has to be prioritised. Won't clean air be more important if we have many people living with the long-term effects of Covid-19." (Public)</i></p> </div> <div style="width: 35%; border: 1px solid blue; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px;"> <p><i>"I think the big issue is the industry has got no money. We've all had nine months, pretty much twelve months without earning any money. Nobody's going to have the money to invest in vehicles next year. Nobody's investing this year, so everybody's a year behind where they were. There's not going to be the money next year, because we're not going to be as busy." (Business, Minibus/Coach)</i></p> </div> </div> <div style="border: 1px solid green; border-radius: 15px; padding: 10px; margin-top: 10px;"> <p><i>"It's obvious that the city will never get back to the levels of commuting we had before. so many people and companies have made the move to home working permanent. we should therefore re-model what we need to do to achieve the targets as post-Covid is clearly going to be a different case." (Public)</i></p> </div>		

## Importance of air quality and confidence the Clean Air Plan will bring down NO<sub>2</sub> levels

Members of the public and representatives mainly agreed there is a need to improve air quality in Greater Manchester, fewer businesses did. A third of members of the public and a quarter of businesses had confidence the CAP would meet its objectives. Some felt the proposals did not go far enough but others felt there were other much larger contributors to air pollution than traffic.

	Air quality needs improving (% agree)	Confidence in the CAP (% agree)
<b>General Public</b>	74	35
<b>Businesses</b>	45	23
<b>Representatives</b>	80	40

### Support of the proposals

Support the Proposal	Further action
<b>Support the proposals:</b> with many stating 'air quality is important' especially with Covid-19 and other respiratory illnesses	<b>Include private cars:</b> supporters of the proposals felt private cars should be included and without them the CAZ will not be very effective
<b>Implement as soon as possible:</b> many supporters felt the proposals should be implemented as soon as possible as pollution needs to be reduced to improve public health	<b>Other initiatives to improve air quality:</b> such as homeworking, discouraging car use, improving traffic flows and preventing idling were all mentioned as ways to reduce NO <sub>2</sub> levels
<b>Need to tackle other pollutants</b> from industry, stopping building on green belt land, the airport were all mentioned as other large contributors to pollution in general	<b>Improvement to active and sustainable travel</b> were seen as important initiatives to improve health and reduce air pollution

*"I believe that air quality is everyone's problem and, as such, cars should also be included in the plans to encourage the use of public transport. This is not just an issue caused by commercial vehicle operators."* (Business, LGV, HGV)

*"We all need to be proactive in helping with Pollution and peoples health."* (Business, LGV and HGV)

*"Great that GM is attempting something so ambitious for the good of local health and wellbeing, and the environment."* (Public,)

*"Allow regional airports to take aircraft away from Manchester, this would reduce air pollution and decrease the amount of vehicle usage around this pollution hub."* (Business, LGV)

*"As someone who mostly walks/cycles I absolutely welcome the initiative. I also support the mitigating measures for support of transport businesses. I also feel that the charges for polluting commercial vehicles are only one of various ways to tackle the pollution problem. Radical and strictly enforced speed limits across GM combined with an extension of bus/taxi lanes and bike lanes would reduce pollution and also make walking and cycling safer, and discourage the use of private vehicles."* (Public)

## Concern about the proposals

Impact on Greater Manchester	
<p><b>Won't improve air quality:</b> some members of the public did not feel the proposed approach will do enough to improve air quality</p>	<p><b>Negative impact on GM business:</b> many businesses stated how they could ill afford the charges or gather the finance to upgrade and therefore the proposals will have a significant impact their business operation</p>
<p><b>Stealth tax / congestion charge:</b> several businesses referred to the proposal as a money-making scheme</p>	<p><b>Negative impact on GM economy as</b> people and businesses will avoid the area and trade, visit or shop elsewhere</p>
<p><b>Increase costs goods / fares:</b> charges would be passed onto the consumer through increased bus fares, delivery charges and taxi fares would increase</p>	<p><b>Will cause business to relocate outside GM:</b> Several respondents stated they would move their home or business to outside GM to avoid the charge</p>

*“Do not proceed with charges. I'm of the opinion that this is just another way of generating revenue, another stealth tax. If any charges are implemented I will move my business to an area outside Greater Manchester.” (Business, LGV)*

*“This will hurt the local economy. So I expect to see prices for goods and services creeping up as the costs get passed on to consumers. Taxi fares will go up, businesses will incur extra costs transporting goods so prices will go up, local man-and-van trades will incur extra costs so their rates will have to go up. For an economy already on its knees from Covid, how can this be a sensible idea?” (Public)*

*“I think because private vehicles aren't banned and stuff like that or are not going to be charged, I don't think there'll be a positive [effect]. There'll probably be a slight positive effect, but some people will have to give up their vehicles, because they can't do that type of work anymore or whatever, it'll have to change.... I don't think it'll be the massive effect that they expect or they hope.” (Public)*

*“Traders will be discouraged from coming to GM and the economy will decline, resulting in financial problems for local authorities and a more depressed environment. Also, higher costs due to surcharges for deliveries.” (Public)*

*“Higher charges for buses, taxis, goods in shops will all be passed on to the consumers.” (Public)*

*“This charge will undoubtedly force operators out of our industry and place a greater financial burden on the ones not eligible for funds to change. The potential knock on effect to our company and the industry in general is significant. This could be that we lose the ability to deliver the volumes required by our customers and so lose contracts and our business suffers. (Business)*

## Table of Contents

Executive Summary .....	4
1. Introduction .....	21
1.1 Background – Overview of the Clean Air Plan .....	21
1.2 The Consultation .....	22
1.3 Objectives .....	22
1.4 Format of Report .....	24
2. Methodology .....	25
2.1 The Questionnaire .....	25
2.2 Data Management .....	25
2.3 Analysis and Reporting .....	26
2.4 Definitions .....	27
3. Respondent Profile .....	29
3.1 Types of Respondent .....	29
3.2 Representativeness of response .....	29
4. Clean Air Zone: Boundary and Hours of Operation .....	36
4.1 Introduction .....	36
4.2 Boundary .....	36
4.3 Hours of operation and management of the scheme .....	43
5. Charges and Exemptions .....	48
5.1 Charges .....	48
5.2 Exemptions and discounts .....	67
6. Funding to upgrade to compliant vehicles .....	91
6.1 Introduction .....	92
6.2 Public without affected vehicles and representatives .....	93
6.3 The Clean Bus Fund – Bus operators .....	101
6.4 The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Van owners .....	101
6.5 The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Business HGV owners .....	103
6.6 The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Coach / minibus .....	104
6.7 The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Leisure vehicles and vans owned by the public .....	106
6.8 The Clean Taxi Fund – Hackney .....	107
6.9 The Clean Taxi Fund – PHV .....	108
6.10 Management of Funds .....	113
6.11 Management of the Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Leisure Vehicles .....	120
6.12 Management of the Clean Taxi Fund – Hackney, PHV .....	120
6.13 Try Before You Buy .....	122
6.14 Vehicle finance offer .....	127
6.15 Hardship fund and additional financial support .....	135
7. Impact of Covid-19 .....	147
7.1 Introduction .....	147
7.2 Level of impact .....	147
7.3 Comments about the impact of Covid-19 .....	149
8. Overall impact of the Clean Air Plan .....	156
8.1 Introduction .....	156
8.2 Air quality .....	157
8.3 Confidence in the Clean Air Plan .....	159
8.4 Additional comments on the proposals .....	161



8.5	Impact of the proposals.....	171
9.	Equality Impact Assessment .....	181
9.1	The EQIA.....	181
9.2	Overall Response .....	181
10.	Comments on the consultation.....	184
	Appendix A Methodology.....	187
	Appendix B Data tables.....	189
	Appendix C Questionnaire .....	279
	Appendix D Qualitative Discussions.....	319
	Appendix E Organisations, Elected representatives and Businesses who responded .....	350
	Appendix F Coding of comments .....	355

## Figures

Figure 3.1	Demographic profile for members of the public (%) * .....	30
Figure 3.2	Local Authority profile for members of the public (%).....	31
Figure 3.3	Local Authority profile for businesses (%).....	32
Figure 3.4	Business size (%).....	32
Figure 3.5	Licensed Local Authority of taxis (%).....	34
Figure 3.6	Impacted vehicles by vehicle type (%).....	35
Figure 5.1	Opinions on the level of charges of bus by vehicle owners.....	54
Figure 5.2	Opinions on the level of charges for coach of vehicle owners (%) .....	56
Figure 5.3	Opinions on the level of charges of HGVs of vehicle owners (%) .....	58
Figure 5.4	Opinions on the level of charges of vans / LGVs of vehicle owners (%) .....	60
Figure 5.5	Extent of agreement with permanent local exemptions (%).....	68
Figure 5.6	Extent of agreement with permanent local exemptions by vehicle type (%).....	69
Figure 5.7	Extent of agreement with temporary local exemptions (%) .....	78
Figure 5.8	Extent of agreement with temporary local exemptions by vehicle type (%).....	78
Figure 5.9	Extent of agreement with permanent local discounts (%) .....	85
Figure 5.10	Extent of agreement with permanent local discounts by vehicle type (%).....	86
Figure 6.1	Taxi drivers stating they could be eligible for funding (%) .....	109
Figure 6.2	Would the funding meet taxi driver needs (%) .....	110
Figure 6.3	Agreement the proposed vehicle finance offer would meet their needs by vehicles owned (%).....	132
Figure 6.4	Respondents support of the hardship fund (%) .....	135
Figure 6.5	Vehicle owners support of the hardship fund (%).....	136
Figure 8.1	Agreement air quality needs improving in Greater Manchester (%) .....	157
Figure 8.2	Agreement air quality needs improving by Local Authority (%) .....	158
Figure 8.3	Agreement air quality needs improving, and the affect air pollution has on the respondent's health (%) .....	159
Figure 8.4	Confidence the CAP will bring down NO <sub>2</sub> levels (%).....	160

## Tables

Table 1-1 Number of responses .....	23
Table 2-1 Respondent Type .....	27
Table 3-1 Type of Respondent .....	29
Table 4-1 Comments on the boundary .....	37
Table 4-2 Comments on the operation times .....	43
Table 5-1 Views of the proposed daily charge .....	49
Table 5-2 Views on each proposed daily charge from vehicle owners (%).....	50
Table 5-3 Comments about charges.....	51
Table 5-4 Views on the daily charge for hackney carriages and private hire vehicles .....	63
Table 5-5 Comments about permanent local exemptions .....	70
Table 5-6 Comments on the temporary local exemptions .....	79
Table 5-7 Overall Comments about the Permanent Local Discounts .....	86
Table 6-1 Summary of funding available .....	92
Table 6-2 Comments about the funds from public without affected vehicles .....	94
Table 6-3 Comments on the management of funds .....	113
Table 6-4 Comments on Try Before You Buy .....	122
Table 6-5 Comments about the Vehicle Finance Offer.....	127
Table 6-6 Comments about the Hardship Fund .....	137
Table 6-7 Comments about additional support .....	143
Table 7-1 Financial impact of Covid-19 .....	148
Table 7-2 Comments about the impact of Covid-19.....	149
Table 8-1 Confidence in CAP and agreement air quality needs to be improved (%).....	161
Table 8-2 Additional comments on the proposals .....	162
Table 8-3 Impact of the proposals .....	172
Table 9-1 Comments about the Equality Impact Assessment .....	181



# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background – Overview of the Clean Air Plan


As set out in the consultation document: Government is working with more than 60 local authorities across the UK to improve air quality. Greater Manchester has received a direction from Government to introduce a Clean Air Plan to bring nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) levels within legal limits in "the shortest possible time".

As air pollution does not respect geographic boundaries, the ten GM Local Authorities (Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Stockport, Trafford, Tameside, Wigan) have come together to produce a joint plan. This co-ordinated approach is seen as the most effective way to deal with a problem that affects all parts of GM and will not be remedied on a site-by-site or district-by district basis. The Clean Air Plan is being co-ordinated by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM).

The core goal of the GM Clean Air Plan is to address the legal requirement to remove ALL concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> that have been forecast to exceed the legal Limit Value (40 µg/m<sup>3</sup>) identified through the target determination process in the "shortest possible time" in line with Government guidance and legal rulings.

Throughout the development of the plan, GM has considered a range of options to deliver compliance, overseen by the GM Steering Group and to understand the type and scale of intervention needed to reduce NO<sub>2</sub> to within legal Limit Values in the "shortest possible time" across Greater Manchester.

In March 2019 the GM Authorities agreed the submission of the OBC which proposed a package of measures that was considered would deliver compliance in the shortest possible time, at the lowest cost, least risk and with the least negative impacts. The core package components, as detailed in the Policy for Consultation, include:



**NOTE:** When Greater Manchester or GM is used to describe the decision-making body in this document, it refers to the 10 Local Authorities of Greater Manchester.

Alongside the CAP, work has taken place to develop proposed licensing standards for hackney and private hire vehicles. A separate but complementary consultation has taken place on these standards and the response to this is reported separately.

TfGM hosted a public consultation on behalf of the 10 Local Authorities. AECOM collated the response to the consultation and independently analysed the response which is presented in this report.

## 1.2 The Consultation

The GM CAP consultation was held between Thursday 8 October and Thursday 3 December (running for 8 weeks in total).

Some of the key characteristics of the GM Clean Air Zone are specified by Government, but the consultation sought views on key elements of the CAZ and funding packages and provided an opportunity for all those with an interest in the proposals to provide further feedback. The outcome will help TfGM gain a better understanding of how the proposals would impact residents, businesses and visitors.

The consultation was based around four key areas:

- The characteristics of the Clean Air Zone including the boundary, timings and charges;
- Permanent and temporary exemptions;
- Funding to support the upgrade of non-compliant vehicles; and
- The impact of Covid-19 on people's ability to respond to the Clean Air Zone.

### Covid-19 statement from the Local Authorities

*“Greater Manchester’s (GM) Local Authorities, following the Government's advice and Ministerial Direction, agreed to undertake a statutory public consultation on the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan (CAP), based on proposals developed before the Covid-19 pandemic.*

*GM is assessing the possible effects of Covid-19 on the Clean Air Plan, as circumstances may have changed and therefore there may be a need to reconsider elements of the proposal including the financial support provided. The consultation therefore asked about the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic to help inform decisions on the nature and requirements for additional support for those most vulnerable to the proposals.*

*GM have stated the information contained within this report, particularly the impacts of Covid-19 will be used to help inform future decisions on each aspect of the final plan. Before bringing a Final Plan to decision makers GM will:*

- *Review all the information gathered through the GM CAP and MLS consultations; and*
- *Fully consider all the information and evidence gathered, so it can understand and mitigate (where possible) the economic impacts Covid-19 has had on vehicle owners and trades affected by the GM CAP proposals.”*

## 1.3 Objectives

The overall objective of the consultation was to inform all interested parties about the proposed Clean Air Plan and to enable them to have their say on the proposals.

**NOTE:** The consultation was not seeking views on whether to introduce a clean air zone as this had already been directed by the Secretary of State. Instead, it set out a position for

consultation on the daily charge, discounts and exemptions of a Category C GM Clean Air Zone, and the proposals for the supporting funds that have been developed taking stakeholder engagement and statistical modelling into account.

The consultation sought:

- To provide an opportunity for businesses, organisations, residents and visitors to have their say on the detailed CAP proposals;
- To fulfil the statutory requirements for the consultation activity related to the implementation of a charging scheme;
- To understand in more detail the impact the measures would have on those who respond, identifying differences by demographics and geography; and
- To understand the impacts on groups who are deemed to be most affected.

### 1.3.1 Response Mechanisms

The consultation adhered to the government's Covid-19 guidance on social distancing in place at the time and therefore no face to face response mechanisms were available. The primary response mechanism was an online questionnaire, available via the TfGM website. Alternative means of responding were also available including:

- A specific version available for respondents who required the use of specialist screen reader software;
- Hard copies available via telephone and distributed via LAs with a freepost envelope provided;
- Letters and emails via dedicated postal and email addresses; and
- Telephone via a dedicated freephone number, a language line facility was also in place for non-English speakers.

The number of responses for each response mechanism is shown in **Table 1-1**.

**Table 1-1 Number of responses**

	Online	Hardcopy (paper)	Letter / Email	Telephone	Total
Number of responses	3,954	43	770	1	4,768

An additional piece of qualitative research took place with those likely to be affected by the proposals. This research ran alongside the consultation survey and took place with:

- 22 online focus groups with up to 5 respondents per group; and
- Six individual depth interviews.

The general public and business owners and managers participated in both group discussions and depth interviews.

A further 40 depth interviews were completed with hackney carriage and private hire vehicle drivers, owners and operators and 4 groups were completed with taxi / PHV users. These were combined with the Greater Manchester Minimum Licensing Standards consultation which ran concurrently.

Further details on the qualitative research can be found in **Appendix D** with the analysis supplementing and supporting the findings in each chapter.

## 1.4 Format of Report

Following this introduction:

- Section 2: describes the methodology with further detail in **Appendix A**;
- Section 3: discusses the profile of respondents with data tables available in **Appendix B**;
- Section 4: discusses the response to the clean air zone (CAZ);
- Section 5: discusses the respondents views of each of the three Funds, vehicle finance, hackney 'try before you buy' and the hardship fund;
- Section 6: details how respondents have been impacted by Covid-19;
- Section 7: discusses the overall impact of the clean air plan on respondents; and
- Section 8: outlines comments about the draft Equality Impact Assessment.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 The Questionnaire

A questionnaire was designed by TfGM on behalf of the 10 GM Local Authorities, a copy of which can be found in **Appendix C**. Prior to the consultation AECOM carried out cognitive and pilot testing, details of which are available in **Appendix A**.

The final questionnaire included questions to elicit comments about:

- The boundary and the operating timings of the clean air zone;
- Proposed daily charges by vehicle type;
- Temporary and permanent local exemptions and proposed local discounts;
- Funding: the clean bus fund, the clean commercial vehicle fund and clean taxi fund;
- The vehicle finance offer and hardship fund;
- Attitudes towards air pollution;
- Confidence in the proposed Clean Air Plan;
- Impact of Covid-19;
- Expected impact of the proposals; and
- Views on the draft Equality Impact Assessment (EQIA).

#### 2.1.1 Focus Groups and Depth Interviews

In order to understand the key concerns and impacts of those who could be most affected by the CAP proposals, qualitative research took place. This research ran alongside the consultation.

The focus groups and depth interviews included the general public, businesses with affected vehicles and taxi drivers and operators. The groups took place over the same weeks as the consultation. Each group was scheduled for 90 minutes with depth interviews for one hour. In each chapter, the findings from the questionnaire are supported and supplemented with the findings from these groups and interviews. Further detail of the groups and the full profile of respondents are shown in **Appendix D**.

### 2.2 Data Management

This section explains how the data was processed and coded. Additional details are available in **Appendix A**.

#### 2.2.1 Data Processing

Response data was downloaded from the online portal and collated with data from all the letters and emails received.

Data was cleaned to ensure accuracy as follows:

- All questions not answered by a respondent were given the same value as “missing” data to ensure these were not included in the analysis; and
- Where a response was specified in free text which could be attributed to an answer in the list provided in the questionnaire, this was updated.

## 2.2.2 Campaigns and Interest Groups

A large volume of identical email responses was received. It is not clear who organised the campaigns and they have been named based on the content of the email:

- 172 emails were received from one group; the Environmental Bill Lobby; and
- 484 were received from the CAZ support group.
- Nine people sent two emails; one for each campaign. In these instances, the emails were combined for each person and analysed as a single response.
- The emails received were coded in the same way as all other responses (see coding section 2.2.3) and where the number of reported responses greatly increased as a result of these emails this is shown in the report.
- The Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) conducted its own survey about the Clean Air Plan and shared its results.
- The British Horse Society and the Horse and Hounds promoted the Clean Air Plan amongst its followers which resulted in a high number of responses from those with private leisure vehicles.

## 2.2.3 Coding

All free-text responses and letters and emails were grouped into themes to allow meaningful analysis. Letter and email responses were combined with the free text comments given in the questionnaire for analysis purposes.

Where possible, free text responses have been analysed by topic rather than response to a question to allow meaningful analysis and avoid double counting where respondents have given the same response to several questions.

The themes from each question were created by AECOM using the initial set of responses, these were verified by TfGM before full coding began. Where new themes emerged, these were verified before continuing. A minimum of 10% quality assurance checks and validation were completed on the coding for each question by both AECOM and TfGM.

Throughout the report quotes from the free text responses and letters and emails have been used to illustrate the points raised. Quotes have been selected to best show the essence of what was said for each theme.

Additional information about the coding process is shown in **Appendix A**.

## 2.2.4 Preparation for analysis

The frequencies for each response per question were calculated, checked and verified to ensure all data had either a response, a no comment or a missing value. This data was prepared for analysis by creating a series of cross-tabs for key criteria such as demographics, vehicle ownership and vehicles impacted, those more vulnerable to air pollution and those impacted by Covid-19. A full list of cross-tabs produced is shown in **Appendix B**.

## 2.3 Analysis and Reporting

The Consultation was open to all and, therefore, respondents were self-selecting. This, coupled with the fact respondents could choose which of the questions they answered, means the results and responses should be viewed as indicative of the wider population and any identified sub-groups rather than representative. The profile of respondents is detailed in the next section.

As respondents were not obliged to answer all questions in the questionnaire, the percentages shown only include those that responded to each question.

Where percentages do not sum to 100% in the main body of the report, this is due to rounding. A \* denotes less than 0.5%.

Statistical significance testing was completed at the 95% confidence level. Where results are reported as different between sub samples, this means the differences are significant at the 95% confidence level. Only data which is significant has been referenced in the report.

The findings from the focus groups have been included alongside the findings from the questionnaire, whether this supports and enhances a point of view with an example or delivers a different point of view may have not been available in the questionnaire data due to the number of responses from a respondent type, e.g. a specific business sector.

A large volume of data was received and therefore the following chapters summarise the main findings and highlight pertinent differences between groups. A set of tables is available in **Appendix B**.

### 2.3.1 Late responses to the consultation

As determined by the 10 Local Authorities, a response was considered late if it was submitted after the deadline of 3 December 2020 at 23:59. Late responses were not counted in the final numbers of responses.

Four online responses, two hard copies and eleven emails were received shortly after the deadline of 3 December 2020 at 23:59 and have not been included in final number of responses. A brief summary of the verbatim responses can be found in Appendix A. All late responses have been passed to TfGM and the Local Authorities for their consideration.

## 2.4 Definitions

To analyse the data for this report, unless specified within the report, respondents have been grouped together as follows. Details of how respondents were grouped for additional analysis is shown in **Appendix A**.

### 2.4.1 Respondent Type

Table 2-1 Respondent Type

Respondent type	Description
General public	A personal response by an individual, the report will also refer to as the public and members of the public
Business / Businesses	A response on behalf of a business including anyone who is self-employed and / or a sole trader and includes taxi owners, drivers and operators
Representatives	An organisation* or a councillor / elected official

\*An organisation includes but is not limited to schools, charities, social enterprise, trade organisations, government bodies.

### 2.4.2 Impacted vehicle

In the questionnaire respondents were asked whether they owned, leased or drive different types of vehicles and if so, whether they would have to pay a charge for any of the vehicle(s):



- **Impacted by vehicle ownership:** A respondent who owns, leases or drives at least one vehicle which they would need to pay a charge for, or they don't know if they would need to pay a charge. Any vehicle impacted by the clean air zone are described as **non-compliant**.
- **Not impacted by vehicle ownership:** A respondent who does not own or lease a vehicle which they would need to pay a charge for, either because they own a vehicle (or fleet of vehicles) which is compliant, or they do not own a type of vehicle which could be charged. All vehicles which will not be subject to a charge by the clean air zone are described as **compliant**.

### 2.4.3 Financially impacted by Covid-19

In the questionnaire, businesses, licensed taxi drivers, owners and operators and organisations were asked specific questions about the effect of Covid-19 and a respondent was defined as financially impacted or not as below:

- **Financially impacted by Covid-19:** A business, taxi driver, owner or operator, or organisation who has stated they have more debt or less savings or lower turnover or lower profitability as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic.
- **Not financially impacted by Covid-19:** A respondent who has stated they have either the same or less debt, the same or more savings, the same or higher turnover or the same or higher profitability as a result of Covid-19.

### 2.4.4 Hackney carriage and private hire vehicles

Hackney carriages are licensed to pick up people who wave for the vehicle to pull over and stop at the roadside or from an authorised taxi rank. Hackneys are often purpose built "black cabs" but don't have to be (depending on local licensing standards) and they may also do pre-booked work.

Private hire vehicles (PHVs) are only permitted to pick people up via a pre-arranged booking. This might be over the phone, on the web or using an app-based booking system.

In this document, if referring to a specific vehicle type, "hackney", "private hire vehicle", or its acronym "PHV" will be used. If referring to this form of public transport generally, "taxi" will be used.



## 3. Respondent Profile

### 3.1 Types of Respondent

A total of 4,768 responses were received to the consultation.

**Table 3-1** shows the response by each type of respondent covering all response mechanisms.

**Table 3-1 Type of Respondent**

	Questionnaire**	Letter / email / telephone***	Total	%
General public	3,148	710	3,858	81%
Businesses (including self-employed and sole traders)	422	19	441	9%
Hackney and private hire vehicle (PHV) driver or operator	334	9	343	7%
Representatives*	91	33	124	3%
<b>Total</b>	<b>3,995</b>	<b>771</b>	<b>4,766**</b>	<b>100%</b>

\*Two respondents did not answer the question about the respondent type in the questionnaire.

\*\*Representatives are a combination of 82 organisations and 43 councillors or another type of elected representative. Of the organisations, 52 completed the questionnaire and 30 responded by email, and 39 councillors or elected representatives completed the questionnaire and four responded by email.


\*\*\*One telephone response was received.

A list of organisations that responded to the consultation are shown in **Appendix E**.

### 3.2 Representativeness of response

**Figure 3.1** illustrates the demographic profile of the general public who live in Greater Manchester and responded to the consultation, via the questionnaire, compared to census data for Greater Manchester.

**Figure 3.1 Demographic profile for members of the public (%) \***



Base: All respondents who live in Greater Manchester


\* Note: Prefer not to say and under 18 (n=13) removed from data for comparison purposes

Those aged under 35, have a lower representation compared to the GM population. Those aged over 35 have a higher representation compared to population statistics for Greater Manchester. Similarly, men and those of White British ethnic origin have a higher representation.

The response by the public by district is shown in **Figure 3.2**. A higher proportion of responses were received from Manchester, Stockport and Trafford than would be expected based on the mid-year population estimates whereas Bolton, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford and Wigan had a lower response than would be expected.

A further 277 (7%) responses were provided from outside Greater Manchester.

**Figure 3.2 Local Authority profile for members of the public (%)**




Base: General public who responded to the questionnaire or by email and live in Greater Manchester

### 3.2.1 Profile of businesses

**Figure 3.3** illustrates the location of Greater Manchester businesses responding to the survey (excluding Hackney and PHV drivers which are discussed in section 3.2.2). The proportion of responses from businesses based in each Local Authority of Greater Manchester is similar to the ONS statistics for most areas. Manchester has the largest difference with 20% of businesses who responded based in Manchester compared to ONS statistics (22%). 77 businesses based outside Greater Manchester provided a response.


**Figure 3.3 Local Authority profile for businesses (%)**



Base: Businesses based in at least one Local Authority in Greater Manchester  
 Businesses may be located in more than one Local Authority

Businesses were also asked to provide information on their size (number of employees) and the sector they work in.

**Figure 3.4 Business size (%)**



Base: All businesses (n=422)

Most businesses who responded had less than 10 employees, however, this was still lower than the proportion of businesses in Greater Manchester which have less than 10 employees. All other business sizes provided a higher proportion of responses than represented than ONS statistics show would be representative.

The response from each business sectors is as follows:

- Construction (21%)
- Transport and storage (21%)
- Arts, entertainment, recreation and other (9%)
- Motor trades (9%)
- Agriculture, forestry and fishing (6%)
- Retail (6%)
- Manufacturing (6%)
- All other sectors (22%) \*

Base: all businesses (n=397)

\*Combined response for all sectors with less than 5% of total responses


### 3.2.2 Profile of taxis

The profile of the taxi respondents is:

- Hackney drivers (44%)
- Private hire vehicle drivers (50%)
- Operators (7%)

Taxis who responded to the consultation are licensed in the following Local Authorities.

**Figure 3.5 Licensed Local Authority of taxis (%)**



Base: All taxi owner, drivers, operators  
 Taxis may be licensed in more than one Local Authority


### 3.2.3 Vehicle ownership

#### 3.2.3.1 Business vehicle ownership

Respondents were provided with a vehicle checker to enable them to ascertain if their vehicle(s) was likely to be compliant or not.

Almost all businesses (80%) had one or more vehicle that could be affected by the CAZ and would need to pay a daily charge for entering or travelling in it. Just 6% of these thought their vehicles were compliant. Four fifths (83%) of Hackney drivers and 74% of PHV drivers had vehicles that were non-compliant or did not know. For the purpose of this report, it is assumed those who stated they do not know if they would be impacted, will be impacted.

**Figure 3.6 Impacted vehicles by vehicle type (%)**



Base: All businesses including Taxis

### 3.2.3.2 General public vehicle ownership

Most of the public (87%) had access to a motor vehicle and 20% had at least one vehicle that could be affected by the introduction of the CAZ.

Of those affected the split by vehicle type is:

- Van / LGV (48%);
- HGV for leisure use (38%);
- HGV (6%);
- Minibus / bus / coach (7%) and
- Other vehicles (11%)

The main types of other vehicles referenced are campervans, motorhomes and horseboxes, while it is noted some respondents will have recorded their specialist vehicles as HGVs for leisure reasons.

## 4. Clean Air Zone: Boundary and Hours of Operation

### Summary of findings


- Respondents were polarised in their views with many (mainly the public and representatives) agreeing with the boundary or wanting it to go further and include more roads such as the SRN.
- Others (mainly businesses) felt the boundary was too wide and should be concentrated on specific areas of high pollution or not introduced at all.
- Concerns were raised by neighbouring authorities about the boundary causing congestion and rat-running just outside the border as people try and avoid incurring a charge.
- The public was most likely to comment in support of the proposed operation time with businesses and taxi drivers concerned about being charged twice in a 24 hour period and suggesting the charging period did not run midnight to midnight to reflect night time shift patterns.

### 4.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the feedback from all respondents about the Clean Air Zone boundary and the timings the Clean Air Zone will be in operation.

### 4.2 Boundary

Respondents were shown the proposed Clean Air Zone boundary and asked to provide any comments they had on this. The consultation document included a description of the boundary as follows:



The proposed boundary of the CAZ would follow the existing administrative boundary of Greater Manchester as closely as possible, excluding the Strategic Road Network (SRN) which is managed by Highways England. The CAZ boundary has been set with the principle that signage would be clear so that vehicle drivers who do not wish to enter the CAZ can take an alternative route.

There is a proposal to exclude a small stretch of the A555 from the junction with the B5166 in the west to the junction with A523 in the east (from Styal Road to the Macclesfield Road junction). This is to enable movements between Poynton and Handforth (which are towns located in the district of Cheshire East), to continue uncharged, given the expectation that implementing a charge would result in local journeys returning to the roads that the A555 was designed to reduce.



## 4.2.1 Comments about the boundary

Just over a third of the public and representatives and a quarter of businesses provided a comment about the boundary. Responses were very polarised between those giving a generally positive comment; one third of members of the public, a quarter of businesses and half of the representatives who commented. Twice as many businesses raised concerns compared to those who commented in support of the boundary.

The table below shows the main comments made by each type of respondent. Not everyone provided a comment.

**Table 4-1 Comments on the boundary**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Support the boundary	459	49	27
Concerns about the boundary	308	115	16
Suggested amendments*	699	78	13
Miscellaneous	117	25	4
<b>Base</b>	<b>1388</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>49</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	36	26	39

\*The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). This point was mentioned in the CAZ support group emails making up two thirds of these comments (n=484).

### 4.2.1.1 Support the boundary

The table below shows the most frequently given comments in support of the proposed boundary.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Zone / boundary / areas covered is fair / appropriate / reasonable	323	28	19	24	342
Include the Motorway/Strategic Road Network	56	5	4	9	50
Make the zone larger (North West / surrounding areas/general)	46	7	0	9	33
Make the zone larger (UK wide / national scale)	29	8	3	7	23
Include specific roads / areas	25	1	3	1	25
<b>Base</b>	<b>459</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>454</b>

Just under a quarter of the public and a little over a third of representatives who provided a comment felt the proposed **boundary is fair and appropriate** (n=323 and n=19 respectively). They tended to support the basis for the proposal that the population and therefore pollution is spread across Greater Manchester:

*“This seems like a reasonable place to put the boundary as it is already a recognized boundary and unlikely that people could accidentally enter the zone without knowing.” (Public, aged 18 – 34, Private Car)*

*“I think it's correct that it doesn't cover just the city centre area. There are high population densities throughout the area highlighted, which all need protecting.” (Public, aged 18 – 34, Private Car)*

*“I feel this area is the right area as they are much more populated than surrounding areas therefore more cars are in Greater Manchester, so I agree with the proposed area.” (Business, Minibus)*

#### 4.2.1.2 Proposals should go further

Some suggested the proposals should go further. Suggestions included:

**Make the zone larger:** The public, in particular (n=75) suggested air quality is not just a Greater Manchester issue and therefore the boundary should be extended. Some suggested it should be extended to surrounding areas whereas others felt it should be UK wide:

*“This is a great start - But it will have little significant effect unless the other towns and boroughs around do not have a similar policy. The only saving grace might be that the Pennines will push the pollution from Yorkshire high enough to pass over Greater Manchester - if that is the case.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Why doesn't it go further, for the whole North West... Or even the whole country? We need to be doing more” (Public, aged 18 – 34, No vehicle)*

*“If possible, this area should be expanded to cover an even larger area. If other councils were willing to be involved that would be beneficial.” (Public, aged 18 – 34, No vehicle)*

Some suggested Clean Air Zones across England should have consistent rules to ensure drivers understand how to travel across various regions with clean air zones in place:

*“We would like CAZs across the UK to have consistent frameworks as it will be costly for us to adapt vehicles for different types of schemes in different cities which will add very significant cost to us....” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

**Include the Motorway/Strategic Road Network** (Representatives n=4 and public n=56): Currently the boundary excludes the SRN, however some stated motorways should be included as a significant amount of polluting traffic is carried on the SRN through the region therefore excluding the SRN will reduce the effectiveness of the CAZ:

*“Fully support this, it should also include motorways that run through the conurbation.” (Councillor / Elected Official)*

*“It should include Motorways - need to lobby highways to include M56, M60, M62 and M602.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“We would question the effectiveness of the scheme when the motorways and trunk roads within the scheme boundary are not included.” (Business, Bus, Coach)*

*“As I understand it the proposals do not include motorways because they are run by Highways England. This is absurd. Pollution doesn't respect these distinctions” (Public, aged 55+, Other vehicle)*

*“Surrounded by motorways! This needs tackling too or will make little difference to air quality! Get heavy loads onto freight and tolls on motorways will cut needless journeys.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

Meanwhile, the focus groups picked up on the concerns from some respondents that excluding the SRN impacts the whole of the Clean Air Zone:

*“So you’ve got a situation where somebody with an older van, driving down their own street could be charged, whereas somebody can drive that same van all the way across the region on the motorway, which goes right through urban areas and they’re not charged?” (Focus Group: B9, LGV,)*

**Include more roads / areas:** The public in particular (n=25): made suggestions for other roads they felt should be included within the boundary:

- A6 (High Lane);
- A580;
- B5328;
- A555;
- M67 Woodhead Pass; and
- A626 Corridor.

Representatives from environmental groups including: Friends of the Earth, Client Earth and Clean Air Levenshulme generally agreed with the proposed boundary with some suggesting the proposals should include additional roads into the zone:

*“The congested and illegally polluted A6 Stockport Road dissects the communities of Ardwick, Longsight and Levenshulme, which have some of the lowest car ownership in the whole of Greater Manchester according to the latest available Census data: 62.5% of households in Ardwick have no car or van, 50.3% in Longsight and 43.5% in Levenshulme. The Clean Air Zone should cover all vehicles, as private vehicles make up the majority of traffic on Manchester’s busiest through-roads such as the A6 and Princess Parkway.” (Organisation, Clean Air Levenshulme)*

*“We agree Greater Manchester’s CAZ charges should include the sections of the A628/A57 which form part of the Strategic Road Network, within the proposed CAZ boundary”. (Organisation, Friends of the Earth)*

#### 4.2.1.3 Concerns about the boundary

Concerns were raised about the boundary, particularly by businesses and taxis. Their concerns included:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Zone / area covered is too big	171	90	7	148	117
Will negatively impact people based on the GM boundary	91	23	5	85	30
Concerns about redistributing to surrounding areas (outside boundary)	79	8	7	31	57
Will negatively impact people travelling to and from Manchester Airport	3	2	1	1	4
<b>Base</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>193</b>

**Zone / area covered is too big** (public n=171; business n=90; representatives n=7): Many of those who gave a comment stated the boundary was too big and wanted to reduce the size of the boundary, stating it was too 'large', 'wide' and was deemed 'excessive'. Businesses with a van (n=48), HGV (n=17) and Taxis (n=29) commented on the size of the area. Several suggestions were given as to what they felt the boundary should be (see **Section 4.2.4**):

*"Not acceptable, too large." (Business, Hackney)*

*"The area is much too large as it covers areas which do not suffer from high NOx and other pollution." (Business, LGV, HGV)*

*"It is not right to include the whole of greater Manchester. The pollution levels are not the same in my town as Manchester city." (Public, aged 18 – 34, LGV, Private Car)*

*"The area seems far too large. extending to a greater area seems to be done to catch more vehicles to be charged. Does not seem proportionate to the task." (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

Respondents in the groups were surprised at the size of the area:

*"I thought it would be for the sort of like inside the M60, I didn't realise it was the whole of the Greater Manchester area." (Focus Group: HGV / LGV, Agriculture, Construction)*

*"I mean I thought they would more likely do the M60. Like the M60's a ring road, because looking at the map before, there wasn't much the other side, out of the M60. Wigan and Bolton and Bury. Yeah, poor old Bury Market, they're a bit stressed about this, because it's going to have quite an effect on them." (Focus Group: Minibus / Coach)*

**Will negatively impact people based on the GM boundary** (public n=91; business n=23): Businesses with vans (n=18), in particular, felt they would struggle if they had to travel across the boundary as they would not be able to pass on the charges to customers as this would make them uncompetitive against businesses outside the boundary:

*"It makes sense to have the zone at the boundary of Greater Manchester however there should be some measures in place to help those small businesses that live just outside the boundary, but that drive to and work in Greater Manchester. I am based in Lancashire, but a lot of my work is in Wigan and Bolton and I will have to pay £10 extra for every job I do there. Ultimately, customers will not pay that extra on top of my fees, and I will end up with no business." (Business, LGV, Private Car)*

*"We are based in Wigan area and it will hurt our business, while business based in Haydock less than 1 mile away will be able to undercut us and there is nothing we can do apart from spend a lot of money changing our vehicles which we can't afford with a pandemic that's already hit us for 70% reduction this year so far, which will take years to get back to normal from. I feel like packing in." (Business, LGV, Private Car)*

*"I appreciate what you are doing but if like me you just live on the boundary and likely to drive no more than a mile in the zone before leaving it that seems unfair." (Public, aged 55+, LGV, Private Car)*

Members of the public (n=62) with an affected vehicle also raised this concern questioning its fairness:

*"I live in north Derbyshire, for me to access the motorway network going north west or south I would have to get to the A555 via the A6 or the M67 via Glossop, so would be charged to access these when I'm not intending to access Manchester, not very fair." (Public, aged 35 – 54, LGV)*

In the focus groups some respondents mentioned the airport and whether charges would be incurred for accessing the airport from outside of GM. This coupled with the airport parking charges could result in an expensive journey to the airport:

*"...Manchester Airport is located on the SRN, but access to the airport required motorists to use very short stretches of the local highway network. This could potentially result in a high charge for those who use very short stretches of the local highway network to enter the airport campus..." (Business, Bus, Minibus, LGV)*

*"Yes, but is that going to be the same, because going into Manchester Airport, if you did it as soon as you came off the M56, there's also then narrow, you know, Greater Manchester roads." (Focus Group: B2, Minibus, Coach)*

**Concerns about redistributing traffic / congestion / air quality problems to surrounding areas (outside boundary)** (public n=79; business n=8): Concerns were raised the size of the boundary would cause a redistribution of vehicles to neighbouring districts.

*"Concerns over impact on those areas just outside the CAZ - vehicles rerouting to avoid the zone and using unsuitable alternative routes" (Public, aged 35 – 54, Private Car)*

*"Need to be careful that unwanted edge effects close to the boundary do not occur. Increased pollution just outside the boundary by services avoiding GM. Effects on local economy. Can areas adjacent to the GM boundary be invited to participate? May need measures to prevent other areas trying to take advantage of GM having higher costs to attract businesses away from GM." (Public, aged 55+, No Vehicle)*

Adjacent local authorities raised concerns the proposals will have a negative effect on those living just outside the boundary:

*"Non-compliant vehicles may be moved from Greater Manchester into St Helens and therefore our residents will be subject to poorer air quality as a result." (Organisation, St Helens Council)*

*"For example, notwithstanding our Bus Alliance agreements, there are risks that non-compliant buses, and also freight could be moved from depots and garages in Greater Manchester into adjoining areas, and for new and cleaner fleets to be moved into Greater Manchester to avoid CAZ penalties, again with unintended consequences." (Organisation, Liverpool City Region Combined Authority)*

Adjacent local authorities have also suggested changes to the boundary to avoid 'rat-running':

*"It is considered that the current exclusion of the sections of the A57/A628 on the Strategic Road Network may lead to "rat running" of vehicles seeking to divert routes within High Peak to avoid a charge." (Organisation, High Peak Borough Council)*

*"We have given considerable thought to local route-choice impacts of the proposed zone in the "Woodford peninsula"... To save any confusion, it would be better if any areas south of the A555 were excluded from the proposed zone. We believe there are potentially significant re-routing impacts for local traffic between destinations within Cheshire East – for instance, Poynton to Handforth – which are disadvantaged by the CAZ purely as a consequence of the administrative boundary." (Organisation, Cheshire East Council)*

Neighbouring local authorities, One Bus and the operator Arriva also raised their concern about issues that will be caused by vehicles turning around along the border of CAZ, which could lead to congestion and further air pollution:

*"There is a risk that some vehicles upon viewing the signage may seek to stop and re-route to try and avoid the charge. This could lead to disruption on the edge of the*

*boundary and beyond in terms of traffic flow and associated impacts such as congestion, air quality, safety and noise.” (Organisation, High Peak Borough Council)*

#### 4.2.1.4 Suggested amendments

The table below shows the most frequently given suggestions for amendments to the proposed boundary:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
City centre should be a ULEZ	483*	2	1	2	1
Boundary should focus on city centre only / M60 boundary	122	51	3	99	74
Zone should just be those with poor air quality	67	26	9	35	59
Exclude specific roads / areas	23	4	1	12	15
Make different boundaries for different vehicles	21	1	0	16	6
<b>Base</b>	<b>699</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>153</b>	<b>145</b>

\*The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). This point was mentioned in the CAZ support group campaign emails making up two thirds of these comments (n=484) [please note one email from the CAZ support group did not include a comment about ULEZ].

A few suggestions were made for amendments to the boundary.

**Boundary should focus on city centre only / M60 boundary** (public n=122; business n=51; representatives n=3): Thoughts were that the boundary should focus on the city centre, M60 ring road or concentrate on areas that currently suffer from poor air quality:

*“It should be in central of Manchester only as it is in London, Birmingham and other cities.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Far too large, should restrict to Manchester City Centre.” (Public, aged 35 – 54, Private Car)*

*“From my point of view if they made the M60 the boundary and gave us say ten years that would make it something that we could work towards, rather than just throwing in the towel. You know where you’d only pay if you went inside the M60.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

**Zone / areas covered should just be those with poor air quality / city centre and towns / high-risk areas** (public n=67; business n=26; representatives n=9): Some also suggested the zone should only be targeted to high pollution areas:

*“It’s too large an area and the problem area are clearly in the built-up conurbations. If this has to be implemented, then it should be far more targeted at areas with specific high pollution issues not a blanket rule across the whole of GM much of which does not have a problem with traffic-based pollution” (Business, LGV)*

*“This is too large. Should be inner city only” (Councillor / Elected Official)*

**City centre should be a ULEZ:** Just over a third (n=483) of the public, a group which was predominately made up of the CAZ support group campaign, felt the city centre should be made into an Ultra-Low Emissions Zone:

*“I call for ..... an Ultra-low emission zone (ULEZ) in Manchester City Centre which includes all polluting vehicles - as unanimously supported by Manchester councillors in January 2020.” (CAZ support group)*

**Access to the Airport:** One local authority made the following suggestion:

*“If the proposal were to proceed based on the boundaries as consulted, then we recommend that there is a further case for the length of A6 MARR between Styal and the Airport to be excluded from the charging regime. This would give Cheshire East residents a toll-free route to Manchester Airport, particularly by taxi, whether for business travel or for leisure. This would allow taxi’s registered in Cheshire East serving the communities of Poynton, Handforth, Wilmslow and beyond to continue to trade without being disadvantaged. We consider access to the international airport is a key requirement of many local businesses and we do not wish to see this access curtailed by the proposed clean air zone. As a comparator, we note the Airport Spur and Motorway network through GM is similarly excluded, thus enabling charge-free access to the airport from within Greater Manchester.” (Organisation, Cheshire East Council)*

### 4.3 Hours of operation and management of the scheme

Respondents were given the following information:

**The Clean Air Zone would operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, signage would be used to clearly identify the Clean Air Zone, and the daily charges would apply from midnight to midnight.**

Around a third of the public and representatives and a sixth of businesses provided a comment about the hours of operation. Over half of the public and representatives generally supported the operation times whereas two thirds of businesses suggested amendments to the operation times.

The table below shows the main comments made by each type of respondent. Not everyone provided a comment.

**Table 4-2 Comments on the operation times**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Support the operation times	856*	16	21
Oppose the operation times	126	32	2
Suggested amendments to operation times	235	61	11
Concerns about operating times	158	26	3
Miscellaneous	35	4	5
<b>Base</b>	<b>1332</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>39</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	35	16	32

\* The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). This point was mentioned in the CAZ support group campaign emails making up half (n=484) of these comments.



### 4.3.1 Support the operation timings

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Support the proposed operation times	856*	16	21	19	387

\*The consultation identified an email campaign, from two environmental groups (see section 2.2.2 for details). This point was mentioned in the CAZ support group emails making up half (n=484) of these comments.

The public and representatives gave mostly supportive comments about the operation timings (n=856 and n=21 respectively). The majority of respondents who supported the proposed operation times (n=387) did not own an impacted vehicle:

*"I support the proposed Clean Air Zone (CAZ) scheme that covers all ten Greater Manchester boroughs and is in operation 24 hours a day, 7 days a week." (CAZ support group email)*

*"This sounds good to me, air pollution is harmful at any time of day" (Public, aged 18-34, No vehicle)*

*"I agree that this works best. Pollution doesn't operate by a clock so make the restrictions 24 / 7 and over time reduce limits to force improvements in emissions" (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*"Not before time. Delighted that it will be 24 / 7 to avoid time shifting of vehicle use / deliveries if operation did not include the night hours." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*"No we need the whole day covered otherwise polluting vehicles when possible would use the free time for deliveries etc." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

### 4.3.2 Oppose the operation timings

Comments made against the operation timings included:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Oppose the proposed operation times	125	31	2	63	95
Unfair to those who do not spend long within the boundary	2	1	0	1	2
<b>Base</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>96</b>

Respondents who owned a business (n=31) commented against the operation times along with some members of the public (n=125). Those who opposed were generally against the Clean Air Plan and viewed it as a money-making scheme that would negatively affect businesses and see charges passed onto the consumer:

*"Not really a clean air zone then! congestion charge because why is it going to run 24/7 when CO<sub>2</sub> levels will be within the legal limits at certain times." (Business, Hackney)*



### 4.3.3 Suggested amendments to operation times

A few suggestions for the operation times are detailed below:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Owner impacted vehicle	Not owner impacted vehicle
Do not charge for evening / night journeys / only charge in daytime	105	22	5	49	82
Change the hours of operation to peak times/hours only	66	27	5	45	50
Do not charge for weekend travel	44	13	2	39	19
Only be charged once within a 24-hour period	31	7	0	15	23
Midnight should not be the end / start between 24-hour periods	8	1	1	2	6
<b>Base</b>	<b>235</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>131</b>	<b>170</b>

**Timing exclusions:** (public n=105; business n=22; representatives n=5): About a quarter of the public who commented on timings stated evenings should not be included and approximately half again stated weekend travel should not be included. The rationale for excluding evening and weekends was their view that traffic levels are lower during these times and this would help to provide businesses with an alternative time to travel. The majority of these comments were from the general public who owned at least one impacted vehicle:

*“I think the charges should be reduced or removed during the night and on Sundays. At such times, traffic is generally free-flowing and therefore not as polluting as during the day especially at peak travel times.” (Public, aged 55+, Leisure HGV, Private Car)*

*“The clean air zone charges should not apply at certain off-peak hours (e.g. 2200-0500) to encourage the businesses/vehicles that cannot afford to/will not upgrade to travel at night when there are fewer people about to inhale exhaust fumes in the short-term. This will also encourage businesses to stay off the roads at busier times and help to reduce congestion.” (Public, aged 18 – 34, Private Car)*

*“I think it should not operate after 7pm on a Mon. Tue. Wed. Thurs. and Sunday.” (Business, Hackney)*

Members of the public who owned at least one impacted vehicle (n=21) suggested the Clean Air Plan should only operate during peak hours during the week, where they felt the majority of the pollution was caused due to commuting traffic:

*“I think the clean air zone should only operate at peak times when a lot of cars are on the road so people would use public transport to get to work, 24 hours a day is not fair on everyone.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“24 hours a day seems a lot given the pollution levels would be highest at peak times (7-10am, 3-7pm). A more focused zone would seem optimal.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Whilst more complex to administer it would be “fairer” if it only applied at peak hours e.g. 0700-0900 and 1600-1800” (Public, aged 55+, LGV)*

The Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) also reported its members did not feel the CAZ needed to operate 24/7:

*“70% of businesses said the CAZ did not need to be a 24/7 scheme. A number of businesses made the point that pollution levels were less at the weekend and should therefore not apply then, or outside of peak pollution times even during the week to give people options.” (Organisation, FSB)*

**Times of operation:** The proposed operation hours caused concern over the application of charging, with many querying or concerned a single journey could be charged twice. For example, travel just before and after midnight. These concerns were particularly raised by businesses (n=7) including taxi drivers and night-time economy businesses. Many suggested 4am would be a more appropriate changeover time to fit with most nightshifts:

*“We support the 24/7 nature of these proposals. However, we would urge Greater Manchester to ensure that only one payment occurs per rolling 24-hour period. This is to avoid double charging those using the GM road network between 2359 and 0001 from incurring double charges for a single journey. This is particularly an issue for the night-time economy, and for businesses such as the airport that are used overnight.” (Business, Bus, Minibus, LGV)*

*“As a member of a Peak District Mountain Rescue Team our operational area come into Greater Manchester and we do get tasked by Greater Manchester Police & Greater Manchester Ambulance Service. I and other team members have 'non-compliant' vehicles. Given that a callout may go past midnight and team members often travel in their own vehicles, this could equate to a £20/non-compliant team member - just to carry out our voluntary lifesaving work. The midnight-midnight charging is of particular concern for voluntary search & rescue team members do to the often-unsocial hours of our callouts. If no exemptions are made this would be particularly punitive, rather than rolling 24hr periods” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV, Private Car)*

*“If I’m working at night and overnight, i.e. from 9pm until 3am, then I’m going to get charged twice for the one shift? That will eat into my income, especially when those times are the main shifts I do. (Depth Interview: Hackney Driver)*

*“We believe a midnight to midnight ‘charging day’ would disproportionately impact taxi and private hire vehicles... As an alternative, we believe the Clean Air Zone ‘charging day should apply from 4am-4am.” (Business, Private Hire Operator)*

#### 4.3.4 Concerns and queries on practicalities

Some concerns were raised about the proposals including:

	General Public	Business	Represent - atives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Concerns about signage / need to provide clear / easily visible signs	93	13	1	17	89
Concerns about the implementation / enforcement of the CAZ	62	10	2	13	56
Queries about the proposals: times of operation	7	5	0	7	5
<b>Base</b>	<b>381</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>14</b>

**Concerns about signage** (public n=93; business n=13; representatives n=1): Respondents stated the signage of the clean air zone should be clear and should give enough warning about entering the zone:

*“Signage should be present far in advance of the boundary” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“you will need to make them clear for visitors from outside GM” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“However, new signage is notoriously difficult to notice first time around so effort must be taken to make signage stand out as much as possible, and you should provide a settling in period for drivers.” (Business, No Vehicle)*

**Implementation and enforcement** (public n=62; business n=10; representatives n=2): Respondents had concerns about the implementation/enforcement of the clean air zone such as:

- How will non-UK registered vehicles be made to pay?
- How will it be enforced?
- What methods will be used to track those entering the Clean Air Zone? e.g. ANPR
- How will people pay / How will payment be ensured?
- What happens when the air quality has improved – will the charges be reduced / removed?

*“How will not UK registered vehicles be captured and force to pay?” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“How will this [be] monitored? How will the monitoring be able to differentiate between different types of vehicles? Can a company without compliant vehicles pay a monthly/yearly fee (like a license) for its fleet to travel unrestricted within the CAZ? Can 1 vehicle travel in and out of the area multiple times within 24 hours for just 1 charge?” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

*“The payment mechanism needs to be carefully planned and must be enforced.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Is this going to be charged through like a daily charge with cameras involved to pick up vehicles?” (Business, Van)*

*“But I use my van for personal trips though? Am I going to be penalised for those trips also?” (Focus Group: LGV)*

## 5. Charges and Exemptions

### 5.1 Charges

#### Summary of findings

- Views on the proposed daily charges vary, businesses felt charges for all vehicles are too much. The public were divided but slightly more felt the charges are about right or too little.
- Typically, 40% of the public felt charges for each type of vehicle type were too much and 50% felt the charges were either about right or too little.
- Bus charges were the exception for the public with 52% feeling they were too much and 38% about right or too little. Those aged under 35 were more likely to feel the charges are too little or about right and those aged over 45 that the charges are too much.
- More businesses felt the charges for Vans / LGVs and HGVs were too much than the charges for other vehicle types.
- More taxi drivers / operators felt charges for hackney carriage and private hire vehicles were too much than the charges for other vehicle types.
- Comments included concerns that the daily charge would be passed on to the customer.

Respondents were informed of the proposed daily charges in the consultation document:

#### Clean Air Zone: Daily Charges

Daily charges would apply for each day a non-compliant vehicle is used within the GM CAZ, with one charge imposed per vehicle, per "Charging Day" (midnight to midnight), however many journeys the vehicle makes within the GM CAZ in that 24-hour period.

- Hackney carriages - £7.50
- Private hire vehicles - £7.50
- Buses - £60
- Coaches - £60
- Minibuses - £10
- Vans - £10
- HGVs - £60

Owners or registered keepers of non-compliant vehicles used within the GM CAZ will be required to pay the relevant charge via a central Government payment portal. Government intends that a user can pay 7 days in advance, including the journey date (Charging Day), up to 7 days in advance after the journey date including the journey date (Charging Day).

### 5.1.1 Views on the proposed daily charge overall

All respondents were asked to state whether, in their opinion, the charges were too much, about right, or too little for each type of vehicle that may be charged. They were then asked to provide any additional comments on the charges.

Table 5.1 shows a summary of views about the amount proposed as a daily charge by respondent type for each vehicle.

At least a third of the general public thought the charges were too high for all vehicle types. In particular, they thought the charges were too high for buses (52%) and coaches (43%).

Three quarters of businesses felt the charges were too high for HGV (74%) and LGV (75%), but over half thought they were about right or too little for hackney carriages and PHVs (62% and 63% respectively).

**Table 5-1 Views of the proposed daily charge**

Vehicle Type	Respondent type and base	Too much (%)	About right (%)	Too little (%)	Don't know (%)
<b>Bus</b>	General public (n=3003)	52	29	10	9
	Businesses (n=593)	72	14	5	9
	Representatives (n=80)	35	43	13	10
<b>Coach</b>	General public (n=2786)	43	36	12	9
	Businesses (n=511)	70	16	5	9
	Representatives (n=75)	28	45	16	11
<b>HGV</b>	General public (n=2943)	40	31	22	8
	Businesses (n=554)	74	13	6	8
	Representatives (n=77)	29	36	26	9
<b>LGV</b>	General public (2977)	40	33	21	6
	Businesses (n=584)	75	16	5	4
	Representatives (n=83)	37	48	10	5
<b>Minibus</b>	General public (n=2944)	38	38	17	7
	Businesses (n=540)	71	17	5	6
	Representatives (n=80)	33	50	9	9
<b>Hackney carriage</b>	General public (n=2965)	40	33	19	7
	Businesses (n=607)	73	13	8	5
	Representatives (n=80)	31	48	13	9
<b>Private hire</b>	General public (n=2969)	41	33	20	6
	Businesses (n=592)	73	14	9	4
	Representatives (n=80)	34	45	11	10

Base: all respondents

Members of the public aged 35 and over were more likely to feel the charges were too much compared to those under 35.

Members of the public who live in Manchester, Salford or Trafford were more likely to state the proposed charges are generally about right, compared to respondents who live in Bolton, Bury, Oldham, Rochdale and Wigan who felt charges are too much.

Many respondents responded differently for the different types of vehicle however, several respondents gave the same response for all vehicle types:

Those who felt the daily charge for every vehicle type was too much were:

- 22% of the general public;
- 32% of businesses; and
- 34% of respondents who owned at least one impacted vehicle.

Those who felt the daily charge for every vehicle type was about right or too little were:

- 25% of the general public;
- 5% of businesses; and
- 28% of respondents who did not own at least one impacted vehicle.

### 5.1.2 Views on the daily charges from those who own or drive an impacted vehicle

**Table 5-2** shows the opinion of respondents who own any impacted vehicle on every daily charge. The table shows, apart from the daily charge for coaches (69%), at least 70% of those who own any impacted vehicle feel all the charges are too high. For each charge, a respondent who owns an impacted vehicle is more likely to feel a daily charge is too high compared to a respondent who does not own an impacted vehicle.

**Table 5-2 Views on each proposed daily charge from vehicle owners (%)**

£ value of charge is:	Bus	Coaches	HGVs	Van / LGVs	Minibus	Hackney carriage	Private hire vehicles
Too much	86	85	91	82	66	93	87
About right	2	0	4	13	26	3	9
Too little	10	8	4	3	3	2	1
Don't know	2	8	1	2	5	2	3
<b>Base</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>176</b>

Many of the comments received were about the daily charges in general and not vehicle specific. These are described in the next section. Following this specific comment received for each vehicle type are discussed:

- Bus (Section 5.1.4);
- Coach (Section 5.1.5);
- HGV (Section 5.1.6);
- Van / LGV (Section 5.1.7);
- Minibus (Section 5.1.8); and
- Hackney carriage and Private Hire Vehicles (Section 5.1.9).

### 5.1.3 Comments about the charges in general

Although each charge was for a specific vehicle, many respondents commented generally about the proposed daily charges, and these are summarised as an overview of respondents who supported or opposed the charges and other suggestions.

**Table 5-3 Comments about charges**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Support the Charges	709	21	5
Oppose the charges	608	246	10
Other suggestions	128	23	6
Miscellaneous	194	35	12
<b>Base</b>	<b>1536</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>29</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	40	38	24

#### 5.1.3.1 Support the charges

General comments supporting the charges in general included:

	General public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Support the proposed charges / they are good / fair	593*	4	2	8	105
Charges are too low / should be higher (general)	84	7	3	7	86
Charge should be higher for travelling during peak times	41	10	0	12	39
<b>Base**</b>	<b>709</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>250</b>

\* The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). This point was mentioned in the CAZ support group campaign emails, making up half (n = 484) of these comments.

**Support the proposed charges** (public n=593; business n=4; representatives n=2): Those supporting the charges felt they were high enough to encourage change without being too impactful on those unable or unwilling to change:

*“They seem about right. Need to have a good incentive, and the ‘carrot and stick’ model that’s proposed sounds reasonable.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“I think that the lead in time for the charges and financial incentives should enable large vehicle owners (buses, HGV etc) to act to ensure their vehicles are compliant. If they do not do so, then the charges are rightly high, and a disincentive to continued use. Similarly, I think the £10 charge should apply to all light vehicles.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“So, I think it’s good, because as part of what the Government is doing or how they can, because they can’t necessarily control people’s actions, but maybe a charge will. “So, I think it’s good, also if I’m thinking about it from the angle of my health as well, you know what areas are clean as well, so I think that’s really good in that instance, yeah.” (Focus Group: Public aged 18-34)*

Some thought the charges were too low and felt they needed to be higher to act as a deterrent:

*“Charges need to be higher to discourage vehicles with high emissions from using Manchester roads. There should be a higher amount for within the city centre ring road, as the emissions in the city centre as way above the dangerous level. I had a carbon monoxide test after walking through Piccadilly Gardens last year and was too high a level.” (Public, aged 35-54), Private Car)*

**Charges are too low / should be higher** (public n=84; business n=7; representatives n=3): Of all the comments received about charges, some of the public commented charges should be higher, including some who felt private cars should be included. This is discussed more in **section 8.4**.

*“The charges should be as high as possible to deter going in the area. Health & climate change are two of the most critical issues of our time. Private cars should definitely be included as well.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Not enough. Should be about 100 times higher. Disgraceful that you aren’t charging private cars.” (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*“I think it’s strange because there’s so many more people, there’s so many more cars and HGVs and vans for driving into town and I thought you’re meant to be encouraging the people, not just the businesses. It feels like you’re targeting just businesses, rather than individuals and I think it’s the individuals that need to actually do the groundwork and we all need to contribute, it’s not really going to have any effect on people, really.” (Focus Group: Public aged 18-40)*

**Charge should be higher during peak times** (public n=41; business n=8): Some suggested a tiered system based on the time of day to encourage travel during quieter hours in order to lessen congestion related pollution:

*“Perhaps there should be a reduced charge for through the night to spread deliveries out.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“I am generally in favour though would prefer a scheme that discouraged travel during peak hours more. This must be when most pollution is generated during slow moving traffic.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

**Other comments about the charges:** Concerns were raised by the public that the largest businesses could afford the charges, but smaller businesses could not, meaning small businesses would struggle:

*“Leave the small businesses alone they cannot afford to pay more money to you. The large businesses will have some way of not paying it...” (Public aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“It will put an additional cost to small companies that cannot afford to buy a new fleet of vehicles or a new van/car unlike large corporations so it will impact small businesses/ self-employed disproportionately to larger companies.” (Public aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“Big Companies with lot of vehicles... should pay more as they have lot more money and with lots of vehicles, they create significant amount of pollution. Local small companies or self-employed should pay the current proposed amount.” (Public aged Under 18, No Vehicle)*

*“Big businesses with fleet will just be able to add this on to their overall job costs, many of who will not be travelling through GM regularly. The self-employed/sole traders with vehicles affected, who are also GM residents, again will be most affected....” (Public aged 18-34, Private Car)*



### 5.1.3.2 Oppose the charges

General comments opposing the charges in general included:

	General public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Oppose the proposed charges / disagree with the charges	414	156	7	257	316
Differences between charge amounts is unfair	258	112	2	190	182
Charges are too high / should be lower (general)	10	5	2	5	12
<b>Base</b>	<b>608</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>510</b>

**Oppose the proposed charges** (public n=414; business n=156): Over one-third of the comments received were from businesses against the charges, and some members of the public were concerned about the impact the charge would have on businesses and taxi drivers:

*“The classes are too vague / indiscriminate. A delivery driver whose van barely stops running all day is a world of difference from a person who owns a small van for recreational use such as carrying their pet dogs or bicycles etc. Or going camping at weekends. A lot of factors in this country prohibit people from owning more than one vehicle, so anybody who falls into the type of category I’ve just described is very likely to also drive that same small van to work each day. The environmental impact of doing so is no worse than driving the average normal car, so to pay a charge under these circumstances would not be acceptable in my eyes.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“Forget these crippling charges, these are essential vehicles using the city, you need to be looking at none essential vehicles and the probability of banning them altogether. Maybe access only and providing more public transport and park and ride schemes.” (Business, PHV Operator)*

*“£0 would be appropriate across all classes. The Greater Manchester Public Transport system does not work unless you are going into the City Centre. The network of EV charging points is woefully inadequate. The cost of EV charging is becoming punitively expensive currently more than double the actual cost. Sort out the above, make cycling safe, encourage the railway companies to take bikes - 3 per train is woeful-allow electric scooters and resolve the issue by people not using cars voluntarily. Do not persecute the people who have no other option available to make a living.” (Business, LGV, Private Car, Other Vehicle)*

*“My concern is the timescale and I think it is unfair to target industries like us, without targeting cars and all the other vehicles, because they’re the ones that cause all the problems, we all see it. Hundreds of cars with one person in and they’re paying nothing.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

**Differences between charges is unfair** (public n=258; business n=112): Some respondents suggested the charges were not fair based on business size, others felt the charging structure needed simplifying:

*“The prices are not relative. You can’t charge [a large bus operator] the same price as a private bus.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“You’re charging too many types of vehicles. Charge a single fee to commercial vehicles. Simple.” (Organisation, Anonymous, Minibus)*


### 5.1.4 Daily charge for buses

Under the proposals, non-compliant buses will be subject to a £60 daily charge.

Table 5-1 Views of the proposed daily charge above shows half (52%) of the public felt the charges were too high and businesses generally felt the charge was too much (72%). Representatives were more in favour of the charge with (56%) stating it was about right or too little.

Figure 5.1 shows **Bus owners felt the charge was too much (86%)**. It also shows those with other affected vehicles thought the charge was too much (70%). However, those who do not own any type of vehicle thought the charge was about right or too little (55%).

**Figure 5.1 Opinions on the level of charges of bus by vehicle owners**



Base: all respondents

#### 5.1.4.1 Comments about the daily charge for buses

Specific comments relating to the daily charge for bus included:

	General public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Charges are too low / should be higher for – buses	13	2	1	4	12
Charges are too high / should be lower for – buses	75	17	3	19	70

**Charges are too high / should be lower** (public n=75; business n=17): When commenting on the bus charges specifically, most comments were about the charge being too high. The general view was the charge was too high for buses given buses are public transport and respondents felt air quality can be improved through the increased use of public transport:

*“I think that buses and coaches should be cheaper as they are encouraging people to use public transportation instead of using individual transport.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*"I also think that buses should be charged more as they go through [the boroughs] many times a day whereas an HGV/coach may only do one trip into the area." (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*"I'd recommend charging bus companies as much as it's theoretically possible. £60 on the amount that they earn per day might be a drop in the ocean. It might not be enough to make them change their habits." (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*"Bus charges should be lowered, as sustainable affordable transport should be supported. Maybe an incremental slower raise to bus charges could be put in place to allow them to adjust." (Business, LGV)*

*"I think buses should be little or no charge to encourage public transport use and reduce traffic levels." (Public, aged 55+, LGV, Private Vehicle)*

Some members of the public raised concerns that charges would be passed on to the passenger through increased fares, and this view was supported by a representative:

*"Too much for coaches and buses. This charge will be pushed on to the consumer." (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*"We are concerned that with the current commercial operating regime for bus services, the level of charge will have a consequential negative impact upon those using bus services, such as some of our patients and visitors on lower incomes and also some of our key worker staff. Whilst buses are a source of pollution at a greater proportion per vehicle, they provide the opportunity to transport large numbers at greater efficiency." (Organisation, The Northern Care Alliance NHS Group)*

**Charges are too low / should be higher** (public n=13): Although 39% of the public thought the bus charges were about right or too low, very few commented on their reasons why:

*"Assuming these charges are per day and per vehicle these seem fair for taxi and small passenger vehicles but quite light for buses which can carry a large number of people." (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*"There is no excuse whatsoever for buses and coaches exceeding the levels, so if they do then the charges should be much higher. As a cyclist I see buses pumping out disgusting fumes on Oxford Road every day." (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

Very few bus operators commented. Those that did stated:

*"Buses & coaches should have a cheaper charge as they significantly reduce traffic on the roads, cars should have a much higher cost." (Business, Bus, Coach, LGV)*

*"We recognise the daily charge for non-compliant buses has been reduced from £100 per day to £60 per day but still consider this charge to be too expensive if there is any shortfall in the funding stream or delay in the programme to retrofit. Some buses - particularly for education movements or TfGM supported services operate for as little as two hours per day and this charge will make those contracts more expensive to operate or be resolved by fare increases, which seems counterproductive." (Business, Bus)*


### 5.1.5 Daily charge for coaches

Under the proposals, non-compliant coaches will be subject to a £60 daily charge.

**Table 5-1 Views of the proposed daily charge** above shows 43% of members of the public felt the charge for coach was too high, which is less than for buses (52%). Similarly to buses, businesses generally felt the charge was too much (70%). Representatives were more in favour of the change with 61% stating it was about right or too little.

Figure 5.2 shows **Coach owners felt the charge was too much (85%)**. It also shows those with other affected vehicles thought the charge was too much (66%). However, those who do not own any type of vehicle thought the charge was about right or too little (66%).

**Figure 5.2 Opinions on the level of charges for coach of vehicle owners (%)**



Base: all respondents  
 Caution should be used where base is small (n<50)

**5.1.5.1 Comments about the daily charge for coaches from different types of respondent**

Specific comments relating to the daily charge for coaches included:

	General public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Charges are too high / should be lower for – coaches	28	9	0	10	26

\*There were little or no comments about coach charges being too low.

**Charges are too high / should be lower:** The public (n=28) provided most of the comments about the proposed daily charge for coaches:

*“Coaches help with tourism and of course football fan transport. Keep them cheaper.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Coaches and buses take multiple cars off the road adding this charge will increase fares and therefore push people back to private cars.” (Public, aged 18-34, Coach / LGV, Private Car)*

*“For coaches travelling in for events the charge seems a bit high as they may only take one trip in an out of the zone and do very little driving around.” (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

Very few coach operators commented. Those that did (n=7) felt the charge was too high:

*“Why charge so much for those vehicles i.e. buses and coaches which can keep cars off the road due to their multi occupancy? and charging HGV which have to deliver to*

*factories etc which aids employment. If they must be charged why so much?” (Business, Coach)*

*“Each of our EURO V vehicles touch several major towns and cities daily. As such, each vehicle if non-compliant, would be liable for charges of up to £100 per day per city. If just three charging zones were touched, it could easily lead to charges exceeding £200 per day, which would substantially alter our cost base and our current value proposition, in an exceptionally price sensitive market. Many of our customers would simply travel less, if they had to pay higher fares, or in some cases would not feel able to travel at all, leading to significant service cuts and reducing valuable and affordable public transport capacity for residents and visitors.” (Business, Coach)*

Many of the coach businesses involved in the focus groups felt the charge was too much and would take what little profit, if any, they made from their current contracts:

*“You’ve not got the £60/day in your contract to just lose, we just haven’t got it. We’re not being pathetic and just saying it, it’s actually true. We haven’t got that much profit in them contracts, there’s not a lot of profit in them to begin with.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

*“We’re basically staying afloat with the school’s contracts like the other guys are. We are just covering our costs really. The school’s contracts don’t really bring in any sort of profit, if any, but with the private work going as well and we don’t know when it’s coming back, we’re all in the same boat really.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

### 5.1.6 Daily charge for HGVs

Under the proposals non-compliant HGVs will be subject to a £60 daily charge, some leisure vehicles such as horseboxes and motorhomes also fall under this category.


**Table 5-1 Views of the proposed daily charge** above shows half (53%) of the public and 72% of representatives felt the charges were about right or too little. However, three quarters of business (74%) thought them too high.

Figure 5.3 shows **almost all (91%) of HGV owners and HGV leisure vehicle owners (80%) felt the charge was too much** compared to:

- 18% of respondents who do not own a vehicle;
- 36% of respondents who do not own an HGV and only drive a car; and
- 66% of owners of other impacted vehicles.

The figure also shows those without an affected vehicle were more in favour of the charge for HGVs with 57% of those with a car only and 70% of those with no vehicle stating the charge was about right or too low.

**Figure 5.3 Opinions on the level of charges of HGVs of vehicle owners (%)**



Base: all respondents

### 5.1.6.1 Comments about the daily charge for HGVs

Specific comments relating to the daily charge for HGVs included:

	General public	Business	Representatives	HGV owners impacted	HGV leisure owners impacted
Charges are too low / should be higher for – HGVs	27	1	1	0	1
Charges are too high / should be lower for – HGVs	14	14	3	7	3
Charges are too high / should be lower for - private leisure vehicles	57	2	3	1	40

**Charges are too low / should be higher:** The public commented mostly about the charge for HGVs being too low (n=27):

*“HGVs are owned by such large companies, they should be charged more. As many have said, the issues concerning the environment lies with large corporations.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“The charges for goods vehicles are too low. There are loads of dirty diesel vans and lorries on the roads and the charges will not be a big enough incentive. Bus and coach charges are ok but wouldn't want to drive people from these forms of transport, thereby causing more traffic.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“I think HGVs should be charged at a higher rate, as they do not have the same environmental benefits as bus use but are charged at the same rate.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

**Charges are too high / should be lower:** Nearly all businesses who commented specifically about HGVs explained why they thought the charge was too high, since they do not have the profit margins to be able to afford the proposed charge (n=14):

*“We do feel the charges for HGV’s are still too high at the rate of £60 per day. This is an additional potential cost of £360 per week, or £18,000 per vehicle per year which is impossible for a contract haulier in our industry to make back based on their current earning capacity and available driving time. It will simply drive any operators that are unable to afford to change to Euro 6 vehicles out of business. This will also have a significant negative impact on our business as we cannot afford to cover the cost of these charges for them and the construction businesses operating in the region are highly unlikely to accept that they should be paying for it either.” (Business, Private Car)*

*“I think these charges are ridiculous. Living inside the boundary means I’m going to have to find 70£ a day before I even turn a wheel (60 for my truck and 10 for my van). That’s £350 if I work 5 days. How can I pass this on to my customers?” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

*“The average return on a national transport journey with a price of around £330 would be around £10. Journeys into Manchester, due to our closest location.... would be much less than that and achieve a lower return, so that you can see that we would need to run at a loss if we paid the charge. We would need to pass that charge to our customers so businesses in Manchester would receive an additional bill of £10 - £20k pa for their deliveries or around 20% of their current charges” (Business, HGV)*

Representatives stressed the impact of the proposed charge on those they represent:

*“We would urge you to consider keeping any charge to HGV’s as low as possible and to look at all measures to support businesses who are vital to your local economy. These vehicles are delivering essential goods, services and responding to carefully timed delivery slots. We would highlight the decision taken by Birmingham City Council to reduce the cost to £50 for HGVs and suggest this charge be applied in the Greater Manchester CAZ as well. If costs are too high this could curtail the sector’s ability to move to zero emission transport at pace once this new technology becomes available.” (Organisation, BVRLA)*

*“The profit margin for hauliers is 2% (Source: Statistica 2020), which equates on average to a per week margin of £60pw per HGV. A daily charge of £60 per non-compliant HGV is therefore not absorbable - leading to the operator either not entering the CAZ (and so risk disrupting the supply chain) or passing the cost on” (Organisation, Road Haulage Association)*

In the Focus Groups respondents added:

*“Yeah, because obviously an HGV wagon, you don’t buy a new scaffolding wagon, anyway, do you know what I mean, they cost a fortune, but anything above like a 15 plate at the minute, you’re going into like 20 grand and things, so I think I’ll just hold back for five months. If I get money off it and it’s going to reduce the charges that I’m going to be getting, because like I say, I could have nine vehicles out a day, one’s an HGV and that’s going to cost me £150 a day, it’s dearer than my fuel, that.” (Focus Group: LGV, HGV)*

**Charges are too high / should be lower for private leisure vehicles:** A high number of comments (n=40) were received from those with HGVs used for leisure purposes particularly those with horseboxes.



Most of these respondents commented they did not use their vehicles very often and therefore did not feel they were large contributors to air pollution. They also made a number of comments about the potential impacts to them which are described in **section 8.5**:

*“I understand why businesses should be expected to pay but I think it is harsh to impose such high daily charges on private vehicle owners. Many of us cannot possibly afford to replace our vehicles and they are used lightly and rarely, not contributing anything like the damage that daily use by big businesses does. This system penalises poorer people who cannot replace or upgrade vehicles, while wealthier people, who can afford to upgrade also do not have to pay the charge. As always, the wealthy suffer least. Please consider a private leisure vehicle exemption, or at the very least significant reduction to make the use of horseboxes financially viable for those of us who work incredibly hard to fund a hobby which is good for mind body and soul.”*  
 (Public, aged 35-54, Leisure Vehicle, Private Car)


*“The charge means I just won’t go into the region. I won’t attend some of the riding schools there and I now won’t go to the garage that I have gone to for years because he is in Urmston so I would be charged. It is a lot of money, but other people will lose out too.”* (Focus Group: Public Owners of HGVs)

### 5.1.7 Daily charge for vans / LGVs

Under the proposals, non-compliant vans / LGVs will be subject to a £10 daily charge. As with other vehicles, members of the public (54%) and representatives (58%) were more likely to state the charge is about right or too little while businesses felt the charge was too much (75%). (See Table 5-1 Views of the proposed daily charge).

**Van / LGV owners felt the charge was too much (82%)**, while those who own cars or do not own a vehicle are more likely to feel the charge is at least about right (59% and 75% respectively).

**Figure 5.4 Opinions on the level of charges of vans / LGVs of vehicle owners (%)**



Base: all respondents



84% of the public who own a van / LGV felt the charge is too much which compared to 35% of the public who do not own a van / LGV.

### 5.1.7.1 Comments about the daily charge for vans / LGVs from different types of respondent

Comments about the daily charge for vans / LGVs included:

	General public	Business	Representatives	Van/LGV owners impacted
Charges are too low / should be higher for – LGVs	14	1	1	0
Charges are too high / should be lower for – LGVs	21	18	1	22

\*11 of the impacted vehicles are owned by the public

The public provided slightly more comments about the charge being too high (n=21) than too low (n=14) which reflects the fact half of those providing a comment had a non-compliant vehicle. Nearly all comments from businesses were that the charges are too high.

**Charges are too low:** The members of the public who thought the charges were too low (n=14) were concerned about the perceived increase in the use of vans and the amount of miles they do:

*“Given the significant increase in delivery vans expected over the coming years as retail increasingly shifts to online sales and doorstep delivery services, it’s important we take action to minimise the increasing pollution this will cause. Providing there is sufficient financial support available to small traders (but not large delivery fleets), I would support a higher charge to encourage a faster uptake of low emission vans.” (Business, No Vehicle)*

*“£10 is too little for vans as you want to encourage them to be more efficient in their movements. £10 per day is probably too little to make a huge difference.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Vans should be charged more. This will encourage more innovation around getting deliveries into the Clean Air zone.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

**Charges are too high:** The affordability of the daily charge was a concern for those feeling the charge is too high (public n=21; business n=18):

*“I have to pay £60 a week as working on my van 6 days a week when incomes are under £200 and can’t afford difference of £5000 to change a van for euro 6.” (Business, LGV)*

*“I run a small company with 1 small van a tax of £200 a month would put me out of business.” (Business, LGV)*

*“I feel the charge on vans is exceptionally high and will adversely affect small businesses who have already been hit hard due to Covid. We must also remember that all of these charges will be passed onto the general public (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“I think £10 a day is too much to ask at a time when van owners probably can’t upgrade their van straight away.” (Business, No Vehicle)*

The following quote from the focus groups highlights concerns around the charges for van owners:

*“Well, somebody who’s a small builder or has their own small business, that’s £50 a week in that van, that’s £250 a month on top of your road tax and all the other taxis.”  
(Focus Group: LGV)*

### 5.1.8 Daily charge for minibuses

Under the proposals non-compliant minibuses will be subject to a £10 daily charge. There were 43 respondents who stated they owned a minibus of which five chose not to answer the question about charges. Of those that did, 66% felt the charge is too much. Over two-thirds (71%) of business owners state the charge is too high, while in comparison, members of the public and representatives are more likely to state the charge is about right (55% and 59% respectively).

The number of comments received specifically about the minibus charge are shown below. All except 14 minibus owners owned another type, usually a van / LGV or a private hire vehicle.

	General public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Charges are too high / should be lower for – minibuses	11	2	0	3	10

**Charges are too high:** Minibus owners did not provide any comments specifically about the daily charge and the public tended to reference their views on minibuses with other types of vehicles.

*“They seem to penalise public transport and favour private taxis. That said, I think the charges for taxis, private hire and minibuses could put people out of business. At the very least they will increase fares and so the end user, people who are perhaps least able to afford it, will be the ones bearing the cost.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“It would be good if the vehicles that are carrying multiple occupants (e.g. buses, minibuses, taxis) pay less than HGVs, vans etc.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Why on earth would you charge buses and minibuses who reduce the need for cars on the road and reduce the overall emissions by carrying lots of people at once.” (Business, Minibus)*

### 5.1.9 Daily charge for hackney carriage and private hire vehicles

Under the proposals, non-compliant hackney carriage and private hire vehicles (PHV) will be subject to a £7.50 daily charge.

The data for hackney and private hire vehicles is being shown together as some respondents did not differentiate the two types of taxi both from the evidence of the views on the level of the daily charge and the comments received.

The response for both hackney carriage and private hire vehicles is close to identical with just over half the public feeling the charge is about right or too little for hackney (52%) and PHV (53%). Almost three quarters (73%) of businesses felt the charge was too high for both types of vehicle (See Table 5-1 Views of the proposed daily charge).

**Most hackney carriage owners (93%) and private hire owners (87%) felt the charge was too much.**

**Table 5-4 Views on the daily charge for hackney carriages and private hire vehicles**

Vehicle ownership	View on the daily charge	Hackney charge	PHV charge
<b>Owners of a hackney carriage</b> (base: hackney n=159, PHV n=133)	Too much	93%	81%
	About right	3%	11%
	Too little	2%	2%
<b>Owners of a private hire vehicle</b> (base: hackney n=99, PHV n=176)	Too much	86%	87%
	About right	6%	9%
	Too little	7%	1%
<b>Owners of a vehicle that may be charged</b> (base: hackney n=1117, PHV n=1098)	Too much	69%	69%
	About right	17%	16%
	Too little	9%	9%
<b>Car owners who do not own another vehicle</b> (base: hackney n=2117, PHV n=2123)	Too much	39%	39%
	About right	35%	35%
	Too little	19%	20%
<b>No vehicles owned</b> (base: hackney n=418, PHV n=420)	Too much	20%	20%
	About right	42%	43%
	Too little	28%	30%

Base: All respondents; Don't know excluded from the table

Each type of vehicle has been analysed separately however the results are very similar for both types of taxi:

- Almost all (93%) of hackney carriage drivers thought the charge was too much compared to 69% of other vehicle owners;
- While 87% of private hire vehicle drivers felt the charge for PHVs was too much compared to 68% of other vehicle owners;
- Those who do not own a vehicle feel both charges are too low or about right (62% hackney carriage charge and 63% for the PHV charge); and
- There are no significant differences between the views on charges when comparing hackney carriage and private hire owners directly.

#### 5.1.9.1 Comments about the daily charge for hackney carriage and private hire vehicles from different types of respondent

Comments received about the proposed daily charge for hackney and PHV vehicles included:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Hackney impacted	PHV impacted
Charges are too low / should be higher for – hackneys	43	2	0	0	0
Charges are too low / should be higher for – PHV	42	1	1	0	0
Charges are too high / should be lower for – hackneys	26	14	1	7	3
Charges are too high / should be lower for – PHV	22	18	0	2	7

**Charges are too low:** Twice as many comments were made from the public about charges being too low for each type of vehicle (hackney carriage n=43; private hire n=42), compared to the number of comments stating they were too high (hackney carriage n=26; private hire n=22):

*“Taxis and private hire should pay £10. They do lots of miles around the town centres so should pay more.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Taxis are the only vehicles that should be charged as they are constantly going none stop.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

**Charges are too high:** Some comments were received from PHV and hackney carriage drivers stating the charges are too high for their respective vehicle type (n=7 each). Some of these respondents felt the charge was too high including suggesting it could result in drivers losing their livelihoods:

*“The charges are too much and to pay £7.50 per day £52.50 per week is a vast amount out of your wage every week. You are getting penalised for trying to make a living” (Business, Hackney)*

*“The industry is already struggling. Drivers won’t have that sort of money. This will force some of them to leave the industry.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“That’s extortion to be honest how on earth hard working drivers will be able to pay these ridiculous charges when it’s hard to put food on table and paying bills. When overheads are already suffocating Hackney trade and no means of fair competition this would be last nail in coffin for sure” (Business, Hackney)*

*“The charges for taxi are high, due to the business inflation It is not possible to afford £7.50 a day. Sometimes we are not able to make £20 for whole day and pay 7.50 for clean air, what is left for us.” (Business, PHV)*

Members of the public who specifically commented charges were too high for hackney carriages (n=26) and private hire vehicles (n=22) were concerned the charge would be passed on to them:

*“They are much too high for private taxis and hackney carriages, they will not reduce emissions only serve to punish an already struggling industry and its customers.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“Charging taxi drivers, a further £7.50 is going to hit them hard every time they have to enter these areas which will increase costs for customers, or they will lose custom. 60 pounds for buses and coaches is a disgrace. At the very time we should be encouraging public services you are going to force people back into their own private cars where there will be no increase in costs.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“I don’t think any vehicle should be charged. Taxis and private hire vehicles with pass on the charges to their customers.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“These charges will all be passed on to passengers/consumers. Some will affect small companies/individuals e.g. taxi drivers. £7.50 a day is almost £40 for a five-day week for them - how are they supposed to manage to pay this???” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“My first thought was like taxis and buses, they’re like huge vehicles and I don’t think that the companies are going to pay to upgrade them and you know people that are like taxi drivers, if they’ve got their own taxi, maybe they can’t afford to upgrade it to something that’s suitable. So, they’re probably just going to keep paying the charge every day and that’s probably just going to get passed on to the people that pay for the services.” (Focus Group: Public, aged 18-34)*

The taxi trade organisations explained why they feel the charge is too high:

*“As trade we consider that these charges are high particularly taxi drivers are unable to pay these charges trade is already on its knees if they are going to work as taxi driver his first priority will be bring the food on the table and kept the roof on his family’s heads.” (Organisation, NPHTA)*

### 5.1.10 Suggested amendments for the proposed daily charges

Comments were also received giving alternative suggestions for the charging structure.

	General public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Charges should be dependent on the emissions of the vehicle	61	8	2	12	58
Charges should be based on mileage	21	4	2	13	12
Charges should be paid for weekly / monthly / annual rather than daily	17	3	1	8	13
Charge only those who travel in / around city centre most frequently	12	5	1	10	7
Charges should be the same amount for all affected vehicle types	14	2	0	4	12
Charges should be dependent on the size of the vehicle	12	2	0	4	10
<b>Base</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>107</b>

**Charges should be dependent on the emissions of the vehicle** (public n=61; business n=8; representatives n=2): Respondents commented that rather than charging on the age of vehicles, a fairer system would be to charge based on the amount of pollution the vehicle causes:

*“There should be a charge for private vehicles with emissions greater than those produced by a small car. Possibly an additional charge for cars with diesel engines.” (Organisation, Marple Energy Saving Strategy)*

*“Perhaps cheaper or more expensive rates dependent on the quality of the vehicle, to encourage companies to get greener vehicles.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

Members of the public (mainly), made some other suggestions for ways to calculate a charge including **charging by mileage** (n=21) or **frequency** (n=12), **charging based on vehicle size** (n=12) and the **charge should be the same for all vehicle types** (n=12):

*“A standard charge is it the way ....if there has to be a charge it should be based on the mileage of each vehicle in the area I could drive 3 miles a day and pay the same as a vehicle doing 8 hours continuous.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Charge vehicles a higher rate if they are going to be in congested zones. You’re pricing an entire community out. Or is this targeted to discriminate against private owners?” (Public, aged 18-34, Leisure HGV, Private Car)*

*“A car derived van/small light goods vehicle should not pay as much as a Mercedes sprinter or Volkswagen Crafter. Any van which is available in standard car form i.e. 2 front seats, 3 back seats - should not come under the same band as a bigger van.” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV)*

*“A daily charge is too much, what about season tickets?” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

A small number of respondents (public=21; business=4; representatives=2) suggested that mileage per vehicle could be taken into consideration, one representative commented on the difference between deliveries and a tradesperson:

*“Given this is an area which has boomed in the pandemic, consideration should be given to a special ‘local delivery’ or ‘courier’ category. This recognises there is a significant difference in impact between a tradesperson driving to a job once and leaving the vehicle parked up for the day, and a courier which drives all day long. Under the current proposals both would be subject to the same £10 charge. Consideration could be given to requiring that all local delivery vehicles, often referred to as ‘last mile’ are electric sooner than other commercial vehicles. Local delivery companies could also be supported to accelerate the establishment of localised distribution hubs supported by e-cargo bikes.” (Councillor / Elected Official)*

### 5.1.11 Queries about the proposals

Although details were provided in the consultation documents some of the general public (n=85) and business (n=18) responses contained a query about the charges. These queries were regarding:

- How the money from the charges is to be used;
- Clarity on how the charges were developed / agreed;
- Clarity of whether these charges are for the day or every time to enter / re-enter the zone; and
- How the charges will be managed e.g. disputes over charges.

## 5.2 Exemptions and discounts

### Summary of findings

#### Permanent local exemptions:

- 68% of the public, 55% of businesses and 77% of representatives were in agreement.
- Those who commented tended to focus on a specific type of vehicle they agreed or disagreed with e.g. disabled tax class vehicles or specialist HGVs. Those who oppose the permanent local exemptions stated that all vehicles contribute to air pollution.

#### Temporary local exemptions:

- 64% of the public, 54% of businesses and 67% of representatives were in agreement.
- Those who commented and broadly agreed felt the extra time being given to upgrade was fair, while a high proportion of comments from businesses stated there wasn't enough time to upgrade.

#### Permanent local discounts:

- 44% of the public, 46% of businesses and 57% of representatives agreed with the permanent local discounts with one third of the public disagreeing.
- 65% of HGV leisure owners and 54% of private hire vehicle owners agreed with the discounts.
- Some private hire drivers who agreed, did so with a caveat that this should only be available to private hire drivers licensed in Greater Manchester.
- Most of those who disagreed commented that discounts are not needed or have concerns that the system may be abused.

### 5.2.1 Permanent local exemptions

The following explanation was provided in the questionnaire along with a reference to the consultation document for further information.

**Greater Manchester are proposing permanent local exemptions for Clean Air Zone charges for specialist vehicles, vehicles entering Greater Manchester due to a road diversion on the motorway network and vehicles used for the purposes of a disabled person which are exempt from vehicle tax.**



The vehicle types which are currently proposed to have a permanent exemption are:

Vehicle type	Description
<b>Specialist Heavy Goods Vehicles</b>	Certain types of heavily specialised HGVs, such as certain vehicles used in construction or vehicle recovery.
<b>Non-road going vehicles</b>	Certain types of non-roadgoing vehicles which are allowed to drive on the highway such as agricultural machines; digging machines, and mobile cranes.
<b>Vehicles used by emergency services</b>	Certain types of vehicles used by emergency services front line emergency and certain non-emergency vehicles.
<b>Community Minibuses</b>	Those operating under a permit under section 19 or section 22 of the Transport Act 1985, issued by a body designated by the Secretary of State.
<b>Showmen's Guild vehicles</b>	Fairground / funfair vehicles which are registered with the Showmen's Guild.
<b>Driving within the zone because of a road diversion</b>	Vehicles driving within the zone because of a road diversion who would otherwise not have entered the GM CAZ. Applies only while the diversion is active and subject to non-compliant vehicles being on the designated diversion.
<b>Disabled Tax Class vehicles</b>	Vehicles used by, or for the purposes of a disabled person which are exempt from vehicle tax.

Each respondent was asked about the extent of their agreement with the permanent local exemptions.

More respondents agree with the permanent local exemptions than disagree with members of the public and representatives more inclined to agree than businesses or taxis. Figure 5.5 Extent of agreement with permanent local exemptions (%) shows the level of agreement for each type of respondent.

**Figure 5.5 Extent of agreement with permanent local exemptions (%)**




Base: All respondents



When analysed by the type of vehicle owned, **Figure 5.6** shows this extent of agreement. The highest proportion of vehicle owners who agree with the proposed permanent exemptions are HGV leisure and HGV owners (60% and 64% respectively). The two lowest, and the only two with under half the owners agreeing with the permanent exemptions are bus owners (49%) and private hire vehicle owners (47%).

Private hire vehicle drivers are more likely to strongly disagree with the proposed permanent exemptions (27%) compared to HGV and LGV / van owners (13% and 14% respectively).

**Figure 5.6 Extent of agreement with permanent local exemptions by vehicle type (%)**



Base: All respondents who own a vehicle that might be subject to a daily charge  
 Caution should be used where base is small (n<50)

## 5.2.2 Comments about permanent local exemptions

Respondents were given the list of proposed permanent local exemptions from the Clean Air Plan and almost half provided a comment about them.

The table below shows the main comments made by each type of respondent. Of those commenting around half gave a supportive comment.

**Table 5-5 Comments about permanent local exemptions**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
General support	951	169	34
Concerns about permanent exemptions	358	73	10
Type of vehicles that should be permanently exempt	523	138	38
Type of vehicles that should not be permanently exempt	206	24	8
Miscellaneous	283	37	14
<b>Base</b>	<b>1749</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>74</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	45	44	60

### 5.2.2.1 Support for permanent local exemptions

Of those that gave a comment, more than half of members of the public (n=950) and businesses (n=169) provided supporting comments for the permanent local exemptions.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Support / agree with the permanent local exemptions	951	169	34	296	852

Comments included:

*“It is unfair to charge a vehicle a daily rate if they had no other option than to travel in the payment zone due to a diversion.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“I would agree with the statement as it would mean that HGV recovery vehicles would be exempt from the daily charge, this meaning that these specialist vehicles would not have to be replaced.” (Business, HGV, Private Car)*

*“They should be exempt anyway, yeah, yeah. I mean you’re not going to see many tanks driving round Manchester, are you? Obviously, ambulances and police, they’ve got to be exempt from it.” (Focus Group: Public aged 40+, Bus / Taxi users)*

### 5.2.2.2 Concerns about permanent local exemptions

The main concerns raised about the proposed permanent local exemptions were:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Disagree with the permanent exemptions (general)	264	66	5	99	235
Exemptions should be temporary	40	4	0	4	40
Are unfair / more vehicles should be temporarily exempt	28	6	3	17	17
Not needed / should have upgraded already	23	1	0	6	17
Permanent exemptions should be regularly reviewed	13	0	2	1	14
<b>Base</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>312</b>

**Generally, disagree with permanent exemptions:** Of those that gave a comment, about a fifth (n=66) of business and a similar proportion of the public (n=264) and n=5 representatives gave a comment opposing the exemptions in general.

Some of those who opposed noted the permanent local exemptions were not needed and felt vehicles should have been upgraded already. Others stated no vehicle should be exempt because clean air needs to be a priority:

*"There should be no exemptions. It is never impossible to replace a polluting vehicle, only expensive. Our lungs don't care what type of vehicle the pollution has come from. Instead of exemptions, there should be funds available to help organisations and individuals who claim to be unable to afford to change their vehicles to do so." (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*"The purpose is to move to cleaner vehicles. Allowing exemptions prevents this being an incentive to change. Not allowing exemptions means vehicles that are not compliant will be moved to areas outside the zone creating pollution there instead. Removal of exemptions creates a situation where people purchasing non-compliant vehicle's will not be able to travel to the area, meaning will be at a disadvantage compared to those businesses which have invested in cleaner technology." (Business, Private Car)*

*"This policy is supposed to be designed for the protection of the young and vulnerable. To allow dispensation for any vehicle would contradict the whole meaning of the proposal. A polluting vehicle is a polluting vehicle who ever drives it." (Business, PHV)*

*"the number of exempted vehicles (e.g. commercial vans) and the absence of an end date for those exemptions make us dubious of the real effect of the clean air charge." (Organisation, Whalley Range Climate Action Group)*

*"Because the objective is to promote clean air into the city centre or Greater Manchester even and yeah, you'd need to include everybody and I know that includes myself, because I've got a vehicle of my own, but yeah, if that's the purpose of it and the intention is to reduce, yeah, sort of promote clean air and reduce Co2 emissions and whatnot, yeah, then it would include every driver and promote the electric vehicles and low emission vehicles." (Focus Group: Public aged 18-40)*

**Proposed permanent local exemptions are unfair and more vehicles should be exempt** (public n=28; business n=6; representatives n=3): Some respondents felt the permanent local exemptions should cover more affected vehicles, as it was unfair to include only the proposed vehicle types in the exemptions:

*"I think there should be more exemptions. food delivery. school transport. jobs that can't use public transport such as trades carrying tools etc. you want to charge around £50 or should i say take £50 a week from their wages because they haven't got a choice. maybe if an individual's earnings were below a certain amount, they could be exempt. to a lot of people, a vehicle is a necessary evil that sucks money from their pocket, you're going to make that worse or deprive them of a job altogether." (Public, aged 35-54, LGV)*

*"The vehicles listed in this exemptions list are a starting point. They are unique vehicles and thus are expensive to convert or replace. The list needs to have flexibility built into it as some companies may have specialist cranes or recovery vehicles that are expensive custom-built vehicles. This can apply to a range of vehicles. These need including or assessing for inclusion." (Councillor / Elected Official)*

**Exemptions should be temporary or at least regularly reviewed** (public n=40; business n=4): Some felt the exemptions should only be a temporary measure to provide those affected with more time to upgrade:

*"There are probably a number of other categories of vehicle that need exemption that do not appear to have been included" (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*"The aim should be for all vehicles to be low emission. No exemption should be permanent." (Public, age not provided, Private Car)*

*"Permanent exemption means there is no incentive for these vehicles to be compliant, ever. Fine that there is a time delay and understand that some are only on roads for a very limited time so there is little effect. I hope this will be monitored carefully and the cases have to be justified. Also, community minibuses - fair enough that these are given time to comply but an open-ended exemption is putting polluting vehicles into the centre of communities, e.g. travelling to schools." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

### 5.2.2.3 Vehicles that SHOULD be permanently exempt

When respondents specified the certain vehicles, they felt should be included in the local permanent exemptions, the vehicle classes most frequently mentioned were:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Private leisure vehicles (e.g. horsebox, motorhome)	234	17	13	202	40
Vehicles used by disabled / vulnerable users	148	36	6	57	132
Buses	84	10	1	21	74
Taxis (hackneys and PHVs)	51	51	9	57	53
GM residents	34	8	1	26	16
Business vehicles	34	17	5	31	24
Specialist vehicles	18	17	8	22	9
Vans / LGVs, HGVs	16	8	2	17	9
Coaches and minibuses	12	2	1	4	10
<b>Base</b>	<b>523</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>358</b>	<b>307</b>

**Private leisure vehicles** (public n=234; business n=17; taxi n= 4; representatives n=13): Over three quarters of the public who commented that private leisure vehicles should be permanently exempt owned an impacted vehicle; mainly horseboxes. Respondents felt the vehicles that fell into these categories were too expensive to upgrade or were not used enough to justify the upgrade:

*"I would like to propose that horseboxes are specialist vehicles. They are essential to the industry and extremely expensive to purchase in comparison to vehicles of the same age so cannot be affordably upgraded. They are very low mileage, infrequently used and maintained to the highest standards." (Business, LGV, Private Car)*

*"Horse lorries tend not to be used frequently, often they will be used no more than once a week, they therefore do not contribute greatly to Greater Manchester's poor air quality and we would ask that they be exempt from the charges, like the exemption that is being given to fairground vehicles, or have an exemption for 52 days of the year, i.e. once a week." (Organisation, The British Horse Society)"*

**Vehicles used by disabled / vulnerable users** (public n=148; business n=36; representatives n=6): Over a fifth of the public commented vehicles used by disabled and vulnerable users should be exempt. Many of these comments came from those who owned an impacted vehicle:

*"I drive a wheelchair accessible vehicle, and this is tax exempt. My parents (who I live with) have a disabled passenger vehicle that they use to transport me when I don't feel able to drive, for example, I often get tired due to my condition and this means I am unable to drive myself. This disabled passenger vehicle is not tax exempt as you can only have one vehicle with this tax exemption. If the current proposals came into force then we would have to pay when coming into Greater Manchester with whichever accessible vehicle (i.e. adapted van) is not tax exempt and this would mean £10 each time, which is extremely unfair and financially prohibitive. The exemptions should be widened so that it includes ALL disabled passenger vehicles and wheelchair accessible vehicles that are used as such regardless of whether or not they are tax exempt. Non-disabled people have the flexibility of being able to drive or being driven and for most people this can be in the same vehicle but often this is not possible for disabled people in adapted vehicles due to the nature of the adaptations. Please therefore expand the definition of 'disabled passenger vehicle' under the exemptions so that disabled people are not discriminated against in this way and are not financially penalised." (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*"Exemptions should be granted for those who have a genuine need to drive in the zone, such as those with a Blue Badge and other mobility issues, alongside targeted financial support to assist them to upgrade to a zero-emission vehicle." (Organisation, Client Earth,)*

**Buses** (public n=84; business n=10; representatives n=1): Respondents felt buses should be exempt as public transport usage helps towards clean air; and if buses were charged, comments expressed concern the charges would be passed down to the public, deterring the use of buses, when it should be encouraged:

*"Buses should be exempt in order to encourage greater usage." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

**Taxi** (public n=51; business n=51; representatives n=9): Nearly all of the business respondents who commented that taxis should be permanently exempt owned a taxi – either a private hire vehicle or a hackney cab. Comments were made that some vehicles are licensed wheelchair accessible vehicles and should have an exemption:

*"Licensed wheelchair accessible hackney carriages & PHVs registered in High Peak should also benefit from the exemption. High Peak residents, including those in need*

*of wheelchair accessible travel option, are often dependant on key services and facilities with Greater Manchester e.g. health care and education.” (Organisation, High Peak Borough Council)*

Fewer comments (around 50 or less in total) were received about other vehicle types and groups and examples of these comments are shown below:

- **GM residents** (public n=34; business n=8; representatives, n=1);
- **Specialist vehicles** (public n=18; business n=17; representatives n=8);
- **Vans / LGVs and HGVs** (public n=16; business n=8; representatives n=2); and
- **Coaches and Minibus** (public n=12; business n=2; representatives n=1).

*“Charging a van driver from a small business could put a massive strain on the owner of the business that may already be struggling. As for HGV’s that are a part of massive companies they could make a payment to help towards the environment but £60 a day per truck could be very expensive and just because you are a company with one lorry shouldn’t change for a company that as twenty lorries.” (Public, age not provided, Leisure Vehicle, Private Car)*

*“In addition, the Federation proposes an additional small category of historic buses less than 30 years old but greater than 20 years old in order to make appropriate provision for disabled and senior citizens whose access to and participation in historic vehicle events would otherwise be constrained.” (Organisation, FBHVC)”*

Neighbouring authorities requested some specialist vehicles such as cleansing, refuse, highway maintenance and community minibuses which are operating in Greater Manchester and provide valuable services should also be exempt:

*“Provide exemption for St Helens Borough Council vehicles such as cleansing, refuse, winter maintenance and highway maintenance vehicles who due to the nature of the boundary have to cross into Greater Manchester to maintain infrastructure and essential services for very short trips.” (Organisation, St Helens Council)*

*“Licensed wheelchair accessible hackney carriages & PHVs registered in High Peak should also benefit from the exemption. High Peak residents, including those in need of wheelchair accessible travel option, are often dependant on key services and facilities with Greater Manchester e.g. health care and education.” (Organisation, High Peak Borough Council)*

Bus operators suggested driver training buses should be exempt because they are only used for driver training and it is unlikely that they can be retrofitted:

*“Like many bus operators, [Operator name] operates a dedicated fleet of driver training vehicles. These vehicles are primarily older vehicles, which have been cascaded down from the operational fleet and converted to bespoke driver training vehicles. As a result, it is highly unlikely that these vehicles could be retrofitted to the required standard. If such vehicles are not exempted from the CAZ requirements, this will adversely affect our ability to recruit and train new drivers. This in turn will mean that, as staff numbers reduce through natural wastage, services will be reduced and even routes withdrawn, due to the inability to replace staff.” (Business, Bus)*

### 5.2.2.4 Vehicles that SHOULD NOT be permanently exempt

When respondents specified certain vehicles they felt should not be included in the local permanent exemptions, the vehicle classes most frequently mentioned were:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Disabled passenger vehicles	104	17	2	26	96
Driving within the zone due to a road diversion	40	2	3	3	42
Motorway diversions are hard to manage	30	1	1	3	29
Specialist vehicles (e.g. adapted vehicles)	29	3	1	6	27
Historic and military vehicles	23	1	1	4	21
Community minibuses and non-road going vehicles	8	1	0	0	9
<b>Base</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>196</b>

**Disabled passenger vehicles:** Of the comments received from the public about vehicles not being permanently exempt (n=104), respondents commented that disabled passenger vehicles should not be permanently exempt; which is opposite to the 148 comments made by the public in support of vehicles that are used by disabled or vulnerable users being permanently exempt:

*“I think exemption due to disability is unfair as disabled people don’t have to drive in the city centre and this just provides an excuse not to make public transport more accessible. Disabled people are not always exempt from council tax.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

**Driving within the zone due to a road diversion:** Some of the public (n=40) disagree with the proposed permanent exemption of driving through the zone due to diversions and felt these drivers should still be subject to the charge:

*“Diversions are a function of normal travel; no exemptions should apply.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“If it’s a business being diverted into the city, then they should still pay, just like when we have to pay for a toll road.” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV, Private Car)*

Respondents commented on how all vehicles contribute to air pollution and should not be exempt:

*“Because if this system is brought in, and the correct intention is to create cleaner air, then all vehicles public, private, and business vehicles should be liable. I think disabled vehicles will pollute just as much as any other vehicles and the owners should be liable just the same. If these measures are brought in it should be about a fair playing field for all polluting vehicles.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Historic vehicles are gas guzzlers. They produce more pollution than like a modern car.” (Focus Group: HGV, LGV)*

### 5.2.2.5 General concerns and queries about the proposals

Some general concerns were raised:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Concern about enforcement / ensuring the exemptions are not abused	108	4	4	12	102
Queries about the proposals / information not clear	129	25	5	53	102
Other	55	30	6	73	142
<b>Base</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>236</b>

**Concern about the enforcement and ensuring the exemptions are not abused** (public n=108): In the main, it was the public who expressed concerns about the potential for bending or breaking the rules to register vehicles exempt and wanted to make sure there was sufficient enforcement to prevent this:

*“I agree in principle but am concerned the exemptions may be misused/abused. It would need to be robustly managed.” (Public, aged 18-34, PHV)*

*“The exemptions seem very loosely worded and open to massive potential abuse. The only one which can be justified is the exemption for disabled tax class vehicles, which you would have thought would have been covered by the private car exemption anyway.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

**Queries about the proposals / information not clear** (public n=129; business n=25; representatives n=5): Respondents had queries about the permanent exemptions, most were asking for clarification on the wording of the information, especially what a specialist vehicle was:

*“The term 'specialist vehicle' needs to be comprehensively explained before asking people to agree with how such vehicles are treated.” (Public, aged 55+, LGV, Private Car)*

*“So, if you look permanent exemptions, Military Vehicles, so the Government are saying our vehicles are going to be exempt, emergency vehicles, so that's Police, VOSA, fire engines all exempt because that's their money, and then further down you've got a Showman's Guild Vehicle. So why should someone with a fair not have to pay when we have, and surely what we do is more important than a fairground once a year.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*



### 5.2.3 Temporary local exemptions

The following explanation was provided in the questionnaire along with a reference to the consultation document for further information.

**Greater Manchester are proposing temporary local exemptions from Clean Air Zone charges until 31 December 2022 to give certain vehicles more time to upgrade due to cost / supply of a compliant vehicle and to lessen impacts considered outside of the control of the vehicle owner, these include wheelchair accessible hackney / private hire vehicles, and vans.**


The vehicle types which are currently proposed to have a temporary exemption are:

Vehicle type	Description
<b>Vans and minibuses</b> (which are not a licensed hackney carriage or PHV or used to provide a registered bus service)	Light Goods Vehicles (vans) and minibuses which are not used as a licensed taxi, PHV or on a registered bus service, will be eligible for a temporary exemption until 31 December 2022. After 31 December 2022, non-compliant vehicles will be charged.
<b>GM-licensed Wheelchair Accessible hackney carriages &amp; PHVs</b>	Wheelchair Accessible hackney carriages and accessible private hire vehicles (PHVs), which are licensed to one of the 10 GM Authorities, as of the 3 December 2020 will be eligible for a temporary exemption until 31 December 2022. After 31 December 2022, non-compliant vehicles will be charged.
<b>Coaches and buses registered to a business address within GM and not used on a registered bus service within GM.</b>	Coaches and buses registered to a business address within GM and not used on a registered bus service within GM will be eligible for a temporary exemption until 31 December 2022. After 31 December 2022, non-compliant vehicles will be charged.
<b>Outstanding finance or lease on non-compliant vehicles</b>	Non-compliant vehicles subject to finance or lease agreements entered into before 3 December 2020 which will remain outstanding at the time at which the GM CAZ becomes operational, will be eligible for a temporary exemption until the agreement ends or until 31 December 2022, whichever is sooner. After 31 December 2022, non-compliant vehicles will be charged.
<b>Limited supply (awaiting delivery of a compliant vehicle)</b>	Owners or registered keepers of non-compliant vehicles that can demonstrate they have placed an order for a compliant replacement vehicle or retrofit solution, will be eligible for a temporary exemption until such a time as they are in receipt of the compliant replacement vehicle or retrofit solution, or for 12 weeks, whichever is sooner.
<b>Driving within the zone because of a road diversion</b>	Vehicles driving within the zone because of a road diversion who would otherwise not have entered the GM CAZ. Applies only while the diversion is active and subject to non-compliant vehicles being on the designated diversion.

Each respondent was asked about the extent of their agreement with the temporary local exemptions.

Over 50% of all types of respondent agreed with the temporary local exemptions. Businesses were the most likely to disagree (30%) with the temporary local exemptions than any other type of respondent as shown in Figure 5.7.


**Figure 5.7 Extent of agreement with temporary local exemptions (%)**



Base: All respondents

Figure 5.8 shows the extent of agreement by vehicle type. With the exception of hackney and PHV drivers, vehicle owners were more likely to agree than disagree. Hackney carriage and private hire vehicle drivers had the highest proportion of those who disagreed with the temporary exemptions (42% and 36% respectively).

**Figure 5.8 Extent of agreement with temporary local exemptions by vehicle type (%)**



Base: All respondents who own a vehicle that might be subject to a daily charge  
 Caution should be used where base is small (n<50)

## 5.2.4 Comments about the Temporary Local Exemptions

Over a third of respondents provided a comment on the Temporary Local Exemption of which over half gave a generally supportive comment. Over a third of businesses raised concerns.

The table below shows the main comments made by each type of respondent. Not everyone provided a comment.

**Table 5-6 Comments on the temporary local exemptions**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
General support	813	159	30
Concerns	413	122	19
Alternative suggestions*	441	49	11
Types of vehicle should not be exempt	29	3	3
Types of vehicle should be exempt	35	15	5
Miscellaneous	68	9	1
<b>Base</b>	<b>1537</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>55</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	40	39	44

\* The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). This point was mentioned in the Environmental Bill Lobby campaign emails making up three quarters (n=172) of these comments.

### 5.2.4.1 General support for the temporary local exemptions

Half of the comments received about the temporary local discounts gave general support (public n=774; representatives n=27; business n=155).

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Support / agree with the temporary local exemptions / they are fair	774	155	28	243	710
This gives enough time to upgrade	67	5	2	12	62
<b>Base</b>	<b>813</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>747</b>

Respondents felt it was fair to give this additional time to allow vehicle owners to source the funds to upgrade or buy a new vehicle that meets the standard:

*“We welcome the Clean Air Greater Manchester’s proposals to provide a temporary exemption for vans until 31 December 2022 given that the proposed CAZ will affect over 1,200 Royal Mail vehicles. We ask for at least two years between the plans for a CAZ being finalised and the date by which vans will need to be compliant. This will allow sufficient time for Royal Mail to reconfigure the extensive fleet which serves Greater Manchester.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

*“It seems a fair approach and gives time to effect changes.” (Councillor / Elected Official)*

### 5.2.4.2 Concerns about the temporary local exemptions

The following concerns were raised about the proposed temporary local exemptions:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
This is not enough time for the temporary exemption / need longer	226	92	10	151	175
Disagree with the temporary exemptions (general)	122	18	7	31	116
Temporary local exemptions are not needed / should have upgraded	41	4	1	6	40
Will not help / will not be able to afford to upgrade even if more time	20	12	1	23	10
Unfair / more vehicles should be temporarily exempt	11	2	1	8	5
<b>Base</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>338</b>

Most of the concerns raised were about the time being allowed for temporary exemptions and longer was required while others, mainly those who did not own an impacted vehicle (n=116), provided comments in general disagreement with the temporary exemptions.

**There isn't enough time and the exemptions needed longer** (public n=226; business n=92; representatives n=10): of the businesses who felt they needed longer, almost all owned either a van (n=44) or a taxi (n=41) with HGV owners (n=13) and coach and minibuss owners (n=4) also contributing, [note some businesses own more than one type of vehicle]:

*"I don't think the extension is long enough, I calculate that I would need to find £200,000 to upgrade my fleet to avoid charges. This is impossible in two years. This extension should be a 3 year minimum to give business a chance to respond, the government are already looking to remove diesel van from 2030 so any investments in fleet are going to be less value for money going forward." (Business, LGV)*

*"I think that people and businesses are still trying to get through and recover from the Covid pandemic and giving them two years to change their vehicles is not enough time, this should be 3-4 years, to enable business to recover from this pandemic." (Business, HGV)*

*"I agree there should be an exemption period, but you are not giving operators enough time to convert their fleet. Procurement of Specialist HGVs and buses in particular need financial planning well in advance. The exemption period needs to be longer. Please consult with industry separately on this, as members of the general public do not have enough information to make a considered opinion." (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*"Too much has happened this year. No one has the money to be reacting to these proposals. There needs to be some temporary delays. Otherwise people will be forced out of their industries." (Business, Hackney driver)*

*"We in the Hackney trade desperately require these temporary exemptions to be lengthened the timescale it's too short. The main reason for this is availability of vehicles the cost of those vehicles lack of business in the trade which could last for*

*two or three more years and the fact that with the figures drivers are receiving at the moment in revenue the vast majority of the Hackney trade would not be able to secure the finance required to purchase a new vehicle." (Business, Hackney)*

**General disagreement with temporary local exemptions** (public n=122; business n=18; representatives n=7): of those who provided comments disagreeing with temporary local exemptions in general, most (n=116) did not own an impacted vehicle:

*"I do not agree with the clean air zone at all. The temporary exemption is nowhere near long enough. The clean air zone is not needed as vehicles will be upgraded eventually anyway." (Public, aged 18-34, LGV, Private Car)*

Some respondents, mainly the public (n=41) **disagreed with the temporary exemptions** as they felt vehicles should have already upgraded as there has been warning of this plan for years, and no more time should be wasted through exemptions:

*"Clean options are readily available and have been for some time. Allowing an exemption only delays the inevitable required investment. Companies and individual unable to invest in compliant vehicles today are equally unlikely to be able to when the exemption ends" (Business, Private Car)*

*"They already have a number of years warning that the changes are coming so should be acting now" (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

### 5.2.4.3 Alternative suggestions for temporary exemptions

Suggestions included:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Incentivise behaviour change / need more incentives for upgrades	221*	6	3	11	43
Temporary exemptions should be shorter	169	8	4	3	178
Temporary exemptions for vehicles until they are due for an upgrade	57	32	4	36	53
Vehicles should be temporarily exempt until after the Covid-19 pandemic	4	4	0	5	3
<b>Base</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>268</b>

\* The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). This point was mentioned in the Environmental Bill Lobby campaign emails making up three quarters (n=172) of these comments.

**Temporary exemptions should be shorter** (public n=169): Around 15% of comments from the public suggested the temporary exemptions should be for a shorter period of time:

*"We need to reduce the impact of these vehicles urgently, not in 2 years time so whenever the deadline, they are likely to wait as long as they can before upgrading/replacing. Let people know about it now through promotions and set the deadline as December 2021" (Public, aged 34-54, Private Car)*

*"You should bring this into effect sooner. This has been known about for some time and vehicle owners should have had plenty of time to make changes. Meanwhile people are still suffering from the effects of polluting vehicles." (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*"It is fair to allow owners some time to adapt their vehicles but two years seems excessive given that there has been plenty of advanced publicity that the scheme is going to be imposed." (Councillor / Elected Official)*

**Temporary exemptions for vehicles until they are due for an upgrade** (public n=57; business n=32): Some felt they should be provided with temporary exemptions to provide them with additional time to upgrade to compliant vehicles:

*"I think they should be allowed to drive till their age allows them when they're due to change then they should be asked to change to electrical vehicles" (Business, Hackney)*

*"I think the whole process is being fast tracked and rushed. It is not affordable/feasible at this current economic climate because of Brexit and Covid. There needs to be a realistic scope of all proposals and policies. It needs to be phased in gradually. At the moment it is been fast tracked without the majority of general public and businesses unaware." (Business, PHV)*

*"Given the pressure nationally on supply chains to undertake a great deal of [retrofitting] simultaneously we would urge a derogation is applied to specific non-compliant EURO V vehicles used on local bus services of up to 1 year from the date of institution of any CAZ implementation provided that the operator can demonstrate that orders have been made for the retrofit kits and that a contract is in place with an appropriate installer." (Business, Bus, Coach)*

Similarly, a bus and coach company suggested that they should remain exempt until current contracts expire.

*"With an aim of a Spring 2022 launch date there will be a number of contracts which expire within a few months. According to your latest Contract Matrix there are 79 resource school contracts which expire in July 2022. We operate 13 of these. Eight of our vehicles will reach their 15 year limit in July 2022. These buses are already 13 years old so do not qualify for retrofitting and penalties would apply if used. This seems unreasonable given that the contracts were awarded without a requirement to meet the Clean Air Zone requirements. A sensible solution would be to exempt buses with 56 or 07 registration numbers that are used on TfGM contracts until 31 August 2020 (when they non-compliant on age grounds)." (Business, Bus, Coach)*

A few taxi respondents (n=3) felt **vehicles should be temporarily exempt until after the Covid-19 pandemic has passed:**

*"Far too short of a time frame and worse still when you factor in the dramatic affects Covid 19 has had on drivers earnings. Most drivers would have struggled with this proposal under normal business activity. But Covid has decimated earnings and confidence throughout the whole of the industry, PHV and Hackneys alike." (Business, PHV Operator)*

**Incentivise behaviour change** (public n=49 and an additional 172 from the Environmental Bill Lobby email campaign; business n=6; representatives n=3): Respondents felt more needed to be done to make sure polluting vehicles were being taken off the road and upgraded as quickly as they could. Comments suggested support should be provided in order to incentivise behaviour change:

*"Support or incentives should be given to businesses to make the change to compliant vehicles run smoother" (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*"Tackle the issue now, the government should provide the incentives to allow people to upgrade\switch etc." (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

#### 5.2.4.4 Vehicles that SHOULD NOT be temporarily exempt

Respondents who provided a comment felt the following vehicles should not receive temporary exemptions:

	General Public	Business	Represent - atives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Taxis (PHV's and hackney)	18	3	1	5	17
Vans / LGVs	14	0	2	0	15
<b>Base</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>29</b>

**Taxis, both hackneys and private hire vehicles, should not be temporarily exempt** (public n=18): Respondents felt these vehicles are big polluters because of the distance they travel during the day. Some also felt taxis idle with their engines on too often creating more pollution:

*"Private hire and hackney cabs are big polluters per day. Charge is not sufficient to incentivise change." (Councillor / Elected Official)*

**Vans / LGVs should not be temporarily exempt** (public n=14): A similar concern to the one for taxis was given as the reason why vans and LGVs should not be temporarily exempt within the clean air plan. Respondents felt additional funding should be given instead of a temporary exemption:

*"The inclusion of vans on an exemption list doesn't feel right, as they are the second biggest source of air pollution. Funding should be such that those affected can be compensated and transition more quickly. It is the right thing to do, so funding should reflect that." (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

#### 5.2.4.5 Vehicles that SHOULD be temporarily exempt

Respondents who provided a comment felt the following vehicles should receive temporary exemptions:

	General Public	Business	Represent - atives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Specialist vehicles and those used by disabled	15	3	1	5	12
Taxis and private hire vehicles	11	5	4	5	15
Private leisure vehicles (e.g. horsebox, motorhome)	11	1	1	7	6
HGVs	3	5	0	5	3
Buses, coaches and minibuses	1	3	0	1	2
<b>Base</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>31</b>

**Specialist vehicles and those used by disabled people** (n=15): The following quote highlights the concern about these vehicles:

*"This is the type of vehicle my husband drives; the elderly and disabled need taxi services to help them live independently and do their shopping etc. They can't afford higher fares but this is what will happen." (Public, aged 55+, PHV)*

**Private leisure vehicles:** It should be noted there were multiple comments throughout the responses to this question where it was stated instead of private leisure vehicles being



temporarily exempt, they should be permanently exempt. This was spoken about mostly for horseboxes.

Respondents from the equestrian community state their private leisure vehicles (horseboxes) are not significant contributors to pollution, as they aren't on the road for prolonged periods of time and are mainly used at the weekends:

*"I use this box and travel less than 1000 miles per year and most likely only less than 500 miles per year, predominantly on Sundays. My contributions to unclean air are not very significant."* (Public, aged 55+, Leisure Vehicle, Private Car)

Some owners of motorhomes or campervans provided similar comments to horsebox owners:

*"I own a van which is a campervan but its unable to be changed with the DVLA to say it's a motorhome on the log book. I can't afford a newer campervan as own my own car too. My campervan is used outside of the greater Manchester area for the vast majority of the time and I only use it as a second vehicle, on a limited miles insurance policy. I feel people in my situation are being penalised and being put into the same category as someone who uses their van on a daily basis for business use."* (Public, aged 18-34, LGV, Private Car)

#### 5.2.4.6 General concerns and queries about the proposals

Some queries were raised:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Queries about the proposals / information not clear	32	3	0	13	22
Concern about enforcement of temporary exemptions / ensuring they are not abused	23	0	1	4	20
Other	14	30	6	18	37
<b>Base</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>56</b>

**Queries about the proposals / information not clear** (public n=32; business n=3): Respondents who both supported and opposed these exemptions had queries, most were asking for more information and more details:

*"This will depend what support vehicle owners are given. with support there should be time for all adaptations and no need for exemptions. How long would exemptions last?"* (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)

**Concern about the enforcement and ensuring the exemptions are not abused** (public n=23): It was mainly the public who expressed concerns about the potential abuse the temporary exemptions could cause. Comments show respondents wanted to make sure there was sufficient enforcement to prevent this:

*"It seems fair, just needs to be ensured it is not abused."* (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)

*"I understand the rationale, but this should be monitored to ensure temporary exemptions are not abused."* (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)



### 5.2.5 Permanent local discounts

The following explanation was provided in the questionnaire along with a reference to the consultation document for further information.

**Greater Manchester are proposing permanent local discounts for Clean Air Zone charges for private hire vehicles licensed to one of the 10 Greater Manchester Local Authorities and also used as a private car, and leisure vehicles greater than 3.5 tonnes in private ownership.**

The current proposed discounts are:

**Private hire owners:** A discounted charge of 5/7 of the weekly total.

**HGV Leisure vehicles:** Consideration for a charge equivalent to an LGV / van if registered in Greater Manchester.

Each respondent was asked about the extent of their agreement with these discounts.

Only representatives had over 50% who agreed with the proposed permanent local discounts. For each of the general public, business and taxis, while more agreed than disagreed, the proportion who disagreed was generally around one-third for each type of respondent.

**Figure 5.9 Extent of agreement with permanent local discounts (%)**



Base: All respondents

**Figure 5.10** shows the extent of agreement by vehicle type. The two vehicle types (HGV leisure and PHV) who would receive the discounts were more likely to agree (65% and 54% respectively) with the proposed discounts than those who did not own that type of vehicle. In total, around two-thirds of HGV leisure owners (65%) and just over half of private hire vehicle owners (54%) agreed with the proposed discounts.

**Figure 5.10 Extent of agreement with permanent local discounts by vehicle type (%)**

Base: All respondents

## 5.2.6 Comments about the Permanent Local Discounts

Respondents were given the proposed details about permanent local discounts for the Clean Air Plan and asked to provide any comments they had on this. Just over a quarter of respondents gave a comment of which around a third gave a generally supportive comment. However, half of the public and businesses raised concerns.

**Table 5-7 Overall Comments about the Permanent Local Discounts**

General concerns and queries about the proposals	General Public	Business	Representatives
General support	333	60	18
General oppose	623	82	15
Discount amounts	24	4	3
Discounts should be offered to more vehicle types / affected people	86	30	6
Miscellaneous	92	9	4
<b>Base</b>	<b>1115</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>42</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	29	23	34

### 5.2.6.1 Support for the proposed permanent local discounts

Generally supporting comments were received:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	PHV Owners	Leisure Vehicle Owners
Agree with the permanent local discounts	333	60	18	32	51

Respondents who owned a private hire vehicle (n=32) expressed support as many use their vehicles for personal use. A few stressed this offer should only be given to drivers from Greater Manchester, as they feel there is a problem with taxis registered in other parts of the country working within Greater Manchester:

*"We regularly use ours (vehicle) for personal use, so would make it difficult to choose whether to taxi or have a family car if we couldn't do both due to having to pay the charge on days we weren't utilising the taxi as a taxi." (Business, PHV)*

*"A good idea. but only for vehicles licenced within one of the Greater Manchester boroughs. There are too many PHV's currently operating within Greater Manchester that are licenced in the West Midlands and Merseyside that are maintained to a very poor standard of cleanliness and are often too small to be accessed by those with limited mobility." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

Comments from owners of leisure vehicles e.g. a horsebox or motorhome (n=51) mainly showed support for any financial help that would be available to them:

*"Motorhome owners will be able to keep their vehicles. Horse boxes etc are very expensive and essential for social events and training." (Public, aged 55+, LGV, Private Car)*

*"This is an excellent proposal to allow horsebox owners within greater Manchester to use their lorries." (Public, aged 18-34, Leisure Vehicle)*

### 5.2.6.2 Concerns about the proposed permanent local discounts

The two types of vehicle who could be eligible for discounts are leisure vehicles over 3.5 tonnes and private hire vehicles and some comments were made specifically that these should not be offered discounts.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	PHV Owners	Leisure Vehicle Owners
Permanent discounts are not needed	377	52	7	5	7
Concerns about discounts being abused / enforced	124	11	4	1	1
Private hire vehicles should not be offered discounts	86	13	3	0	5
Concerns the discounts will result in people not upgrading	62	2	2	0	0
Leisure vehicles over 3.5 tonnes should not be offered discounts	39	4	2	0	0
Discounts should depend on vehicle age / pollution it causes	6	0	0	0	2
<b>Base</b>	<b>623</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>15</b>

**Private hire vehicles shouldn't be eligible for a discount** (public n=86; business n=13; representatives n=3): Respondents felt these vehicles were heavy polluters:

*"Taxis are perhaps some of the most polluting vehicles so why offer a discount? If the scheme really is about pollution then all polluting vehicles should be charged." (Councillor / Elected Official)*

*"I don't see why PHV should have a discount. They are businesses and any increase in costs can be passed on to consumers. Its then up to the PHV business to choose the vehicle (exempt or not) that best suits their business." (Public, aged 35-54, LGV,)*

*"Private hire vehicles are inefficient in moving large numbers of people. It makes no sense to discount them." (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

**Leisure vehicles over 3.5 tonnes should not be offered discounts** (public n=39; business n=4; representatives n=2): Most comments centred around all vehicles causing pollution and therefore did not agree with the discounts:

*"I believe that private cars should be included in the restrictions, so discounting cars that are sometimes used privately makes no sense to me." (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*"I disagree with the proposed permanent discount for leisure vehicles in private ownership >3.5t. These vehicles contribute to air pollution and need to be brought up to modern standards." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

The majority of comments provided by respondents did not always refer to one of the two discounts and spoke in more general terms about discounts.

**Discounts are not needed** (public n=377; business n=52; representatives n=7): Just over half the comments provided by the public and businesses mentioned they felt discounts weren't needed as they felt every vehicle going through the Clean Air Zone should be charged. Others felt vehicles should have been upgraded already and therefore discounts were redundant.

Most of the comments that discounts are not needed were provided by those who do not own an impacted vehicle:

*"Giving a discount would reduce the incentive to change to a less polluting vehicle. Also, public transport, cycling and walking should be being encouraged as modes of transport over driving. Use of private cars and taxis should ideally be reduced in order to improve air quality, reduce carbon emissions, and reduce congestion." (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*"The provisions should apply to all vehicles that don't meet emissions standards, offering discounts undermines what the scheme is seeking to achieve." (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*"These owners have known for a reasonable time that the clear zone was being implemented so should have started to make provision to acquire compliant vehicles." (Business, PHV)*

*"We are concerned that the local discounts focus on the vehicles use rather than its impact on the environment. The example given of a PHV being used as a private car sometimes and therefore being charged 5/7 of the normal penalty is not applicable if the vehicle is used as a PHV seven days per week." (Business, Bus)*

**Concerns about discounts being abused and how the discounts would be enforced** (public n=124; business n=11; representatives, n=4): Some felt the discounts felt like a loophole for certain vehicles to pay less and questioned how the discounts would be checked and overseen:

*"All private hire vehicle owners will simply claim their vehicle is used as a private car and therefore claim the exemption. This would make the charge on private hire vehicles pointless. This loophole is too large." (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*"This seems like an exemption that would be difficult to police and right for abuse. Keep it simple charge polluting vehicles from entering our city." (Public, aged 18-34, LGV, Private Car)*

**Discounts could result in people not upgrading their vehicle** (public n=62; business n=2; representatives n=2): stating the cost of an upgrade or replacement vehicle was larger than the charges once the discount was applied:

*"It would seem likely that quite a large number of vehicles could fall within this reduction and thereby undermine the effectiveness of the changes. Given that most vehicles are probably leased, any change should be limited to the expiry of the average lease following the commencement of the zone." (Business, Private Car)*

*"A permanent discount on PHVs also used as private cars could provide a disincentive to adopting cleaner vehicles. Their primary function is commercial and this alone should be sufficient to bring them up to standard or pay the full clean air charges. Giving a discount because the vehicles may be used outside their working hours seems inappropriate and I am surprised this is being considered. PHV proposed charges are already low in any case." (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

### 5.2.6.3 Discount amounts

	General Public	Business	Representatives	PHV Owners	Leisure Vehicle Owners
Discounts should be higher	18	3	3	2	8
Discounts should be lower	5	1	0	0	0
Discounts should be higher due to / until through the Covid-19 pandemic	1	0	0	0	0
<b>Base</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>8</b>

**Discounts should be higher:** Suggestions were made the discount amount should be higher (public n=18; business n=3):

*"for motorhomes, this does seem a bit draconian as these are privately owned vehicles - many are only in use at set times – e.g. off on holidays but where the motorhome is also the only private vehicle owned by a family, this charge would be prohibitive. Perhaps a double discount down to the level propose for PHV might be in order." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

### 5.2.6.4 Discounts should be offered to more vehicle types / affected people

Suggestions included:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	PHV Owners	Leisure Vehicle Owners
Discounts for: located outside GM but operate within	29	5	3	2	13
Discounts for: leisure vehicles under 3.5 tonnes	27	1	0	0	6
Discounts for: more vehicles / affected people	14	3	0	2	6
Discounts for: buses, coaches and minibuses	7	1	1	1	0
Discounts for: business vehicles	7	1	0	0	1
Discounts for: hackneys	6	20	3	1	0
<b>Base</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>25</b>

**Those who are located outside of Greater Manchester but operate within the region** (public n=29; business n=5; representatives n=3): This comment was raised in particular by those who live just outside of the Greater Manchester boundary, feeling they should be provided with a discount if they are not going to be eligible for funding support to upgrade:

*"I live 50m just outside the boundary, but the motorhome is kept within GM. I will have to move sites and travel much further to avoid the £60 charge as I won't be eligible for a discount. I will be causing more pollution or will have to sell the motorhome. I can't believe that motorhomes contribute much, they do far fewer miles than cars for example." (Public, aged 35-54, Leisure Vehicle, Private Car)*

**Hackneys:** where 19 of the 20 comments were provided by hackney carriage owners. Some respondents felt other vehicles with the potential to be used privately should be treated the same as a private hire vehicle and should also receive a two-day discount:

*"Hackney carriages, vans and minibuses can also be used for private and leisure use so should be treated the same." (Organisation, Tameside Owners & Drivers Association)*

*"I find it strange that you just offer a discount to private hire vehicles that are used also as family cars as there are many hackney carriages that also are used as family cars and should be afforded the same exemption." (Business, Hackney)*

**Leisure vehicles under 3.5 tonnes:** 27 comments were made by the public of which 6 were leisure vehicle owners and while these comments were referencing a discount for this size of vehicle from the £10 daily charge, they did not specify the level of discount they would expect:

*"What about vans or other vehicles uses for leisure but less than 3.5t? Many people have smaller Ford Transit, VW Transporter or other type of van which is solely used for leisure and not linked to a business. This must be considered in proposals and can be proved through households sharing details of their employment to prove their vehicle isn't used for a business." (Public, aged 25-34, LGV / Van, Private Car)*

## 6. Funding to upgrade to compliant vehicles

### Summary of Findings

- There was a high level of support for the funds and many felt they were needed in order to help businesses upgrade.
- All types of vehicle owners felt the gap between the cost of a compliant vehicle and the amount of funding being offered was too great. Of those that thought they were eligible for funding\* the following felt the funds would meet their needs:
  - PHV (51%)
  - Hackney (19%)
  - Van (17%)
  - HGV (26%)
- It was believed the devaluation of current vehicles and the inflation of prices for new vehicles because of the proposals would increase the financial deficit.
- Many businesses were not inclined, or able, to take additional finance options at the moment, owing to the impact of Covid-19, Brexit and general uncertainty for the future. There was a lot of concern about taking on more debt.
- Some suggested, to have the biggest impact on air quality, the funds should be prioritised for the most polluting vehicles.
- Others suggested funds should be targeted towards those that need them most.
- Concerns were raised for those that are based just outside of the boundary, and several comments were made that funding should be available to them.
- Some members of the public were against the funds as they did not feel public money should be used to help private business, and many felt companies should have already upgraded their vehicles.
- There were some concerns about mismanagement of the funds and people taking advantage of the scheme.
- Try before you buy received a mixed reaction; some felt it was a good idea, however, many questioned the capability of electric vehicles and the current infrastructure, and they did not see the benefit of the scheme.
- There was strong support for the hardship fund.
- Many respondents stated they needed additional funding and time to help the upgrade of their vehicles.








\*Many did not think they would be eligible for funding even though their responses suggest they would be.



## 6.1 Introduction

Greater Manchester is requesting a package from Government to support owners or registered keepers of non-compliant vehicles with the cost of upgrading to vehicles that don't incur a charge. The figure below, taken from the consultation materials, summarised the key funding available for the different affected vehicles:

**Table 6-1 Summary of funding available**

 <b>Buses</b>	 <b>Hackney carriages</b>	 <b>Private hire vehicles</b>	
<p>Proposed support for those eligible and have a non-compliant bus which is used on a registered bus service in GM.</p> <p>Grant of up to £16,000 per vehicle for replacement or retrofit.</p> <p>Bus operators will not be offered access to the vehicle finance scheme.</p> <p>No proposed cap on number of vehicles per applicant.</p>	<p>Proposed support for those eligible with a non-compliant hackney carriage licensed with the Greater Manchester Authorities.</p> <p>£10,000 per vehicle for a running costs grant or a contribution for vehicle finance, for a replacement zero emissions capable wheelchair accessible vehicle.</p> <p>or</p> <p>£5,000 grant towards an LPG retrofit.</p> <p>There is also a UK government grant available of up to £7,500 for purchasing a new zero emissions capable vehicle.</p> <p>Limit of 8 vehicles per applicant.</p>	<p>Proposed support for those eligible with a non-compliant private hire vehicle licensed with the Greater Manchester Authorities.</p> <p>£1,000 grant or vehicle finance contribution towards replacement to a compliant petrol or diesel vehicle</p> <p>or</p> <p>£2,000 grant or vehicle finance contribution towards replacement to a hybrid or plug-in hybrid</p> <p>or</p> <p>£2,500 running costs grant for replacement with a zero emissions capable vehicle.</p> <p>or</p> <p>£5,000 grant or vehicle finance contribution towards replacement of a minibus or WAV.</p> <p>Limit of 10 vehicles per applicant.</p>	
 <b>Light Goods Vehicles (vans)</b>	 <b>Heavy Goods Vehicles</b>	 <b>Coaches</b>	 <b>Minibuses</b>
<p>Proposed support for those eligible with a non-compliant van.</p> <p>Applies to these four vehicle types<sup>17</sup></p> <p>A grant of £3,500 per vehicle for replacement or vehicle finance contribution.</p> <p>Limit of 10 vehicles per applicant.</p>	<p>Proposed support for those eligible with a non-compliant HGV</p> <p>Applies to these four vehicle types<sup>17</sup></p> <p>A grant of up to £5,500 per vehicle for replacement or vehicle finance contribution. Limit of 10 vehicles per applicant.</p> <p>or</p> <p>A grant of up to £16,000 per vehicle for retrofit. Limit of five vehicles per applicant.</p>	<p>Proposed support for those eligible with a non-compliant coach.</p> <p>Applies to these four vehicle types<sup>17</sup></p> <p>Grant of up to £16,000 per vehicle for replacement or retrofit or vehicle finance contribution.</p> <p>Limit of 10 vehicles per applicant.</p>	<p>Proposed support for those eligible and have a non-compliant minibus.</p> <p>Applies to these four vehicle types<sup>17</sup></p> <p>A grant of up to £5,000 for replacement or vehicle finance contribution for replacement of minibuses (which are not licensed taxis or PHVs or used on a registered bus service in GM).</p> <p>Limit of 10 vehicles per applicant.</p>

<sup>17</sup> Available for vehicles registered in GM, small and micro businesses, sole traders, charities and social enterprises, private owners, initially targeted towards individuals and the smallest businesses with the oldest vehicles..

All respondents were asked for their comments on the proposed funding offers. Those with affected vehicles were asked if they thought they would be eligible to apply and, if so, would the proposed funding meet their needs.



In this section, we describe:

The response to the funding options by relationship to the CAP and the vehicles they own:

- Public without affected vehicle and representatives\*;
- The Clean Bus Fund;
- The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Van;
- The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – HGV;
- The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Coach / minibus;
- The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Leisure vehicles;
- The Clean Taxi Fund – Hackney; and
- The Clean Taxi Fund – PHV.

The management of funds;

- Try Before You Buy;
- The vehicle finance offer; and
- The hardship fund and additional support.

\*Where representatives are related to, or have commented on a particular industry, these comments have been reported in the relevant section.

## 6.2 Public without affected vehicles and representatives

The Clean Bus Fund, The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund and The Clean Taxi fund were introduced to everyone as follows:

**The Clean Bus Fund (CBF):** Greater Manchester are proposing financial support to help operators who are registered in Greater Manchester and run a registered bus service in Greater Manchester.

**The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (CCVF):** Funding to support coaches, minibuses, HGVs or vans.

Greater Manchester are proposing financial support to help smaller local business, sole traders and the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) organisations upgrade vans and HGVs, minibuses and coaches, to cleaner more compliant vehicles.

**The Clean Taxi Fund (CTF):** Greater Manchester are proposing financial support to help upgrade hackney carriages / private hire vehicles licensed to one of the 10 Greater Manchester Local Authorities to cleaner compliant vehicles.

In this section we describe members of the public without affected vehicles response to each of the three funds. It was assumed members of the public who emailed did not have an affected vehicle.

There were significant levels of support amongst the public for the funds, particularly the Clean Bus Fund (n=633) and the Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (n=541). Fewer comments were received about the Clean Taxi Fund, but those that did largely supported the fund.

Some concerns were raised about the operation of the funds.

**Table 6-2 Comments about the funds from public without affected vehicles**

	Clean Bus Fund (CBF)	Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (CCVF)	Clean Taxi Fund - Hackney (CTF – Hackney)	Clean Taxi Fund - PHV (CTF – PHV)
Support the fund*	633	541	470	286
Need more funding	80	569	78	64
Oppose the fund	206	81	193	159
Operation of the scheme	132	132	142	76
Miscellaneous	143	134	109	92
<b>Base</b>	<b>1067</b>	<b>1363</b>	<b>865</b>	<b>596</b>

\*The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). This point was mentioned in the Environmental Bill Lobby campaign emails, making up a quarter (n=172) of these comments.

### 6.2.1 Support for the funds

Support for the funds included:

	Clean Bus Fund (CBF)	Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (CCVF)	Clean Taxi Fund - Hackney (CTF – Hackney)	Clean Taxi Fund - PHV (CTF – PHV)
Support the proposed funding / funding is important / needed to be able to conform/upgrade*	574	506	435	249
Funding should be available to all vehicle types / fair to all (general comments)	76	42	44	41
<b>Base</b>	<b>633</b>	<b>541</b>	<b>470</b>	<b>286</b>

\*The consultation was subject to an email campaign, from two environmental groups (see section 2.2.2 for details). This point was mentioned in the Environmental Bill Lobby emails, making up two thirds (n=172) of these comments.

Examples of general supportive comments about all the funds include:

*“I welcome this idea [bus fund] and think that as much support as possible should be directed towards supporting public transport operators to reduce the financial impact of the changes.” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

*“I think the [commercial] fund is a good idea and will be welcomed. The UK government should provide the funds to support this.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Supporting them is the only way they will be able to switch vehicles. If you want the scheme to be successful you must give them support.” (Councillor / Elected Official)*

*“I know cabbies don't make a huge living, so there needs to be grants and incentives to support the transition into new vehicles as opposed to letting them opt out if they say they cannot pay.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“We need to make sure they're compliant and these [PHV] drivers are less likely to be able to afford to upgrade. But there are far more of them, at least where I live, so they are polluting more.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

Members of the public stressed the importance of the funding in aiding buses to improve air quality and to help encourage the use of public transport instead of cars:

*“I think it is a very good idea to help bus companies upgrade their buses to more environmentally friendly vehicles, I am aware of some vehicles that run within GM that are approaching 15 years old which is not good. so overall this is an excellent idea.” (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*“Yes. We need good clean buses. Please do this. There has to be a viable alternative to cars and currently there isn’t one.” (Public, aged 35-54, Other Vehicle)*

*“I think they should really be focusing on people, encouraging people to get on public transport and upgrading the public transport and not penalising the cab drivers and the taxi drivers.” (Focus Group: Public, aged 18-40)*

There were concerns amongst some respondents that if enough funding was not provided to help bus operators and PHV drivers upgrade, the costs would be passed on to customers, which could disproportionately impact vulnerable users:

*“I support this. If the bus companies aren't given financial support, the only people who will lose out will be members of the public who rely on bus travel as the companies will increase fare prices to accommodate with the additional costs.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“All hackney carriages / taxis should be eligible for support and the funding amount should be the majority of the cost it would take to upgrade their vehicles. Otherwise they won't be able to afford to do it. And the cost of the fee if their vehicles are not green enough would just be passed on to passengers - disproportionately affecting disabled people who rely on these vehicles.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

## 6.2.2 Funding amounts

Comments about the funding amounts for each fund included:

	Clean Bus Fund (CBF)	Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (CCVF)	Clean Taxi Fund - Hackney (CTF – Hackney)	Clean Taxi Fund - PHV (CTF – PHV)
Funding should be higher for [fund]	51	76	57	47
All companies / operators work in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible	30	491*	18	15
<b>Base</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>567</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>64</b>

\* The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). This point was mentioned in the CAZ support campaign emails making up almost all (n=484) of these comments.

**Funding should be higher:** Several comments were received from members of the public expressing concern the proposed funding amounts were not enough in the CBF (n=51), CCVF (n=76), CTF - Hackney (n=57) or CTF - PHV (n=47):

*“You're going to need a lot more funding for this element, because bus operators on average keep their fleet for between 10-20 years and with them costing well over £100,000 each for the majority of vehicles, they will need more money before 2023 to be convinced to upgrade them- especially to hybrid or electric as they are even dearer.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“The grant limit for both bus and coach of £16,000 per vehicle is not a true reflection of the cost of retrofit and we understand it was based on average cost, setting a higher limit would be fair and equitable.” (Organisation, CPT)*

*“In summary, the funding package is inadequate. As a minimum, the funding envelope should cater for all 6615 affected HGVs which, on the grant amounts specified under section 5.5, would imply a fund of at least £30m for HGVs. However, the grant amounts specified are in themselves inadequate to bridge the market-value gap between Euro V and Euro VI vehicles.” (Organisation, Road Haulage Association)*

*“These operators (both hackney carriage and private hire car drivers) are self-employed and have been severely hit recently by the lockdowns. Many of them have operated during the restrictions and have provided a service because they would have no income otherwise. Under normal circumstances, they make very little profit and so they should be given priority and to the maximum amounts.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

The view of owners of each type of vehicle on the levels of funding are discussed in the following sections.

**All vehicles that operate in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible** (CBF n=30; CCVF n=491; CTF - Hackney n=18; CTF - PHV n=15): Several mentions were made about vehicles registered outside GM but operate within, with some feeling these should be eligible for funding. This was particularly mentioned by the CAZ support group campaign about vehicles covered by the commercial fund (n=484):

*“Government to provide financial support to help those individuals and businesses who need to change to cleaner vehicles.” (CAZ support group campaign email)*

*“Coaches that come into greater Manchester bring vital business for our towns so they should be helped to - and our local coach companies should have money to so that they can change.” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

*“Business that are based or operate in the city should not be penalised and should receive any help where possible to mitigate excess charges.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“Inevitably, those who live outside GM but spend time working in GM may feel disadvantaged and less willing to travel into GM to work, e.g. trades people from outside GM will be disadvantaged when working in GM to those who are based in GM.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“This is unfair to taxi drivers just over the border of GM. It gives GM taxi drivers an unfair advantage.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“I think taxi drivers who can prove they live and work in GM regardless of where they are licensed for should get financial help.” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

### 6.2.3 Oppose the funding

Comments received against each of the funds included:

	Clean Bus Fund (CBF)	Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (CCVF)	Clean Taxi Fund - Hackney (CTF - Hackney)	Clean Taxi Fund - PHV (CTF - PHV)
Funding should not be available / not needed – should have already upgraded by now/use own money (general)	193	57	181	139
Funding / financial support will not help / work (e.g. will not help in the long-term)	0	16	0	0
Don't agree with fund because don't agree with charges	1	6	5	7
Funding amount is too high / too much funding (general)	15	3	8	17
<b>Base</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>159</b>

Reasons respondents were against the fund included:

**Funding should not be available/not needed – should have already upgraded by now / use own money:** Several comments were received opposing funding being available, particularly for CBF (n=193), CTF - Hackney (n=181) and CTF-PHVs (n=139). Fewer comments were received about vehicles covered by the CCVF (n=57). The main reasons given included:

- Public funding should not be used to support private companies:** some felt these companies should not receive public funding as the need for funding was greater for others:

*“Public money should not be used to support private companies get their houses in order.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“I disagree that such support should be provided. Public taxpayers’ money should not be squandered to underwrite the costs of private enterprise and businesses.” (Public, no age provided, LGV)*

*“The funding should go to only buses and taxis. Businesses should fund their own vehicles from their profits. After all, it’s tax deductible.” (Public, aged 55+, LGV, Private Car)*

*“They should be able to do this with all the profits they are making if not they wouldn’t be running a company why should we support this from our taxpayer’s money they have big pockets let them pay.” (Public, aged 55+, LGV, Private Car)*
- Companies should have already upgraded their vehicles:** many responses were opposed to the funding being made available as they felt companies have had time to upgrade their vehicles:

*“I do not think large companies such as [bus operators] should be able to get benefit from this, as they should have been investing in cleaner vehicles for a long time now.” (Organisation, Friends of the Trans Pennine Trail)*

*“I’m not sure taxpayers’ money should pay for this, when black cab drivers have already been over charging us all for years. Its normal to have to replace a car every once and a while, especially when it is your profession so I’m not sure they should be funded at all.” (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

- **Companies can afford the costs / should use the money from their profits:** there were also comments opposing the funding, declaring many companies have the money to make the changes themselves:

*“Bus companies should plan and fund vehicle upgrades through their company profits or return ownership to local authority. Why should the taxpayer fund new vehicles whilst company bosses continue to take a dividend?” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV)*

- **Funding amount is too high / too much funding:** (CBF n=15; CCVF n=3; CTF-Hackney n=8; CTF-PHV n=17): Some comments mentioned the funding amount was too high, in addition to opposing companies receiving funding:

*“I think the fund is excessive. Lots of the buses in Manchester are a disgrace. These companies should have some corporate responsibility to not poison our air.” (Public, no age provided, Private Car)*

*“Just don't give them too much, they should have been investing in this tech years ago.” (Public, aged 34-54, Private Car)*

## 6.2.4 Operation of the scheme

Comments received about the operation of each of the funds included:

	Clean Bus Fund (CBF)	Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (CCVF)	Clean Taxi Fund - Hackney (CTF - Hackney)	Clean Taxi Fund - PHV (CTF - PHV)
Funds should only be for voluntary / community organisations / charities / services	0	49	0	0
Concerns about where funding is coming from for this/transparency over funds	31	29	52	25
Funding should only be for sole traders / smaller companies	17	20	15	6
Funding should not come in the form of a repayable loan / should be given as a lump sum grant	0	6	2	1
Funding should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	61	13	36	18
Funding should only be available to Taxis licensed in Greater Manchester	0	0	20	17
Funding should be provided as a repayable loan / not given as a grant	14	13	18	11
Payment of funds	12	0	2	0
<b>Base</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>622</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>76</b>

Key comments regarding the operation of the scheme included:

**Concerns / queries about where funding is coming from for this / transparency over funds** (CBF n=31; CCVF n=29; CTF-Hackney n=52; CTF-PHV n=25): Some comments from respondents queried where the funding would come from, particularly for the funding of Hackney Carriages, with fears the public / taxpayer would be funding the scheme:

*“Who’s paying for this? Where’s the money coming from.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Who pays for this funding. Yes, us local taxpayers. Yet another example of local authorities spending our money in ways not asked for by the population...” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“It is as it is but this vague there’s going to be funds here and grants here, until you know what the criteria is, it doesn’t really mean anything does it.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

**Funding should only be for smaller companies** (CBF n=17; CCVF n=20; CTF-Hackney n=15; CTF-PHV n=6): Respondents mentioned the funding should only be available for smaller companies, with several comments stating larger companies did not need more support:

*“Most of the smallest bus companies use ageing buses. It would better to get them to purchase new buses/coaches or help them in doing so. The big bus companies can look after themselves.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Money should be filtered down to the smaller operators instead of the bigger bus companies receiving all the benefit, the larger companies have more financial backing from investors/banks whereas the smaller family run companies may not have the assets/banking backing.” (Business, Bus, Coach, Minibus)*

**Funding should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles** (CBF n=61; CCVF n=13; CTF-Hackney n=36; CTF-PHV n=18): Several responses made a reference to the funding only being provided to operators if they upgraded to low emission vehicles (e.g. hybrids and electric), with comments highlighting the importance of improving air quality:

*“Maximum funding should only be available for replacement vehicles that are zero emission.” (Organisation, MESS (Marple Energy Saving Strategy))*

*“Eligibility should be for hybrid that can run on zero emission in the relevant zones or full zero emission vehicles this should also include coaches and school buses that are major polluters.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“No diesel-powered vehicles should be purchased - preferably battery electric only.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

**Funds should only be for / prioritised for voluntary / community organisations / charities/services** (CCVF n=49): Several comments felt funding should only be for Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprises (VCSEs). There were calls VCSEs should be ‘prioritised’ before commercial trades due to their ‘importance’ and ‘social value’:

*“Voluntarily, community and social enterprises should be supported before any commercial operations.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“I would support vehicles for charitable status organisations as a priority, since those are already recognised as having social value....” (Public, aged 35-54) No Vehicle)*

*“Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) organisations must get full support. The Covid-19 pandemic has demonstrated the sheer importance of these organisations.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

**Payment of funds** (CBF n=12; CTF-Hackney n=2): A few comments from those who responded made additional suggestions regarding who should be funded. Suggestions included only paying those who have already upgraded their vehicle(s) and only releasing funds after new equipment / vehicles have been invested in rather than in advance of upgrading:



*“There needs to be a strong deterrent to driving dirty vehicles, and those with cleaner tech should be rewarded.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“There needs to be a way to ensure that this funding is not used to effectively subsidize bus companies who have continued to run older polluting vehicles or failed to invest in modernizing their fleets. Perhaps the funding could be weighted in favour of companies that have already gone part of the way to modernizing their buses...” (Councillor / Elected Official)*

## 6.2.5 Other

Other comments received included:

	Clean Bus Fund (CBF)	Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (CCVF)	Clean Taxi Fund - Hackney (CTF – Hackney)	Clean Taxi Fund - PHV (CTF – PHV)
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	73	80	40	33
Out of scope for proposals – impact / I ack of enforcement of taxis registered outside of Greater Manchester (e.g. in Sefton)	0	0	0	31
Out of scope for proposals – impact / lack of enforcement of Uber	0	0	28	19
Concerns about availability of electric charging infrastructure / need more charging points	5	9	22	8
Concerns about performance of electric vehicles	4	4	3	1
Other	64	43	24	18
<b>Base</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>92</b>

**Queries about the funding amount / provision / conditions** (CBF n=73; CCVF n=80; CTF-Hackney n=40; CTF-PHV n=33): Several respondents had queries about the proposals in terms of the funding amount / provision and conditions:

*“Doing a quick estimate based on the costs of a new bus, £30M approximates to around 150 new buses purchased, so is this figure really enough to upgrade the Greater Manchester bus fleet?” (Organisation, The Northern Care Alliance NHS Group)*

*“Agree this can be done if bus companies are engaged correctly” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

**Out of town taxis:** Some respondents voiced concerns about the impact of out of town taxis (CTF-PHV n=31) and Uber (CTF-Hackney n= 28; CTF - PHV n=19) on the taxi and PHV trade in Greater Manchester. Some were concerned there was a lack of enforcement on such taxis and local businesses should be prioritised:

*“Only comment is to ensure all vehicles are owned and Licensed in Greater Manchester. As a former private hire owner / driver, I was aware of drivers from other authorities continually working in the Stockport area which was unfair and took work*



*away from me as a Stockport resident and tax payer. I was also aware of drivers letting unlicensed drivers use their vehicles!!” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“All PH vehicle owner working In Manchester regardless of council they associated with should be treated equally.....they shouldn’t be discriminated against. as hundreds of GM residents PHD now opt to go with Sefton, Wolverhampton councils as they are cheap and hassle free as compared to local councils. (Business, PHV)*

*“With the amount of work left for Hackney carriage drivers in Manchester [as] cross border plying for hire started stealing all the work and council not being able to put a stop to this theft of work from Hackney trade” (Business, Hackney)*

### 6.3 The Clean Bus Fund – Bus operators

Anyone who is registered to run a commercial bus service in Greater Manchester is eligible to apply for funding. Not everyone who runs a bus service owns a bus: some are coaches for example, used for school services. There are very few bus operators in the data therefore, their responses have been collated in this section.

There were 46 respondents who completed a questionnaire who owned at least one bus. In addition, six emails were received from bus operators. From the questionnaire, two respondents commented on why the fund would not meet their needs:

*“Strongly believe the costs will increase to meet the new demand.” (Business, Bus / Coach)*

*“We await confirmation of eligibility for funding of all vehicles but are confident a good solution can be agreed with TfGM.” (Business, Bus / Class V Training Bus)*

In terms of the emails received from stakeholders, these were some key points made from bus operators:

*“We welcome the aim of the Fund and understand the management and distribution. We do however recognise the shortfall against the initial ask and have some concern that there may be a shortfall in the number of compliant vehicles at the time the charging is introduced. There could also be delays in supplies of the necessary kit which may lead to installations being delayed or suspended.” (Business, Bus)*

*“We encourage TfGM to maximise retrofit and other measures and then take stock of whether CAZ is still required.” (Business, Bus)*

*“The grant limit for both bus and coach of £16,000 per vehicle is not a true reflection of the cost of retrofitting, and we understand it was based on average cost, setting a higher limit would be fair and equitable.” (Organisation, CPT)*

*“The contribution of £16,000 is unlikely to be sufficient to make a case for investment. It is around 50% of the typical cost of a ten year old vehicle and if there are 350 vehicles to replace, there is likely to be a significant supply issue which could cause a price rise. Operators may also need to dispose of vehicles at a loss as the market price for a 13 or 14 year old vehicles is unlikely to exceed the book value” (Business, Bus, Coach)*

### 6.4 The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Van owners

Of responses from businesses, 598 had at least one van or LGV. Of which, 90% thought they would currently incur a charge when the CAZ is introduced. Under the proposals, businesses with vans will be able to apply for a replacement grant of up to £3,500 per vehicle or vehicle finance offer (see section 6.10).

However, just 29% (n=159) thought they were eligible for the fund even though the majority were based in Greater Manchester and therefore would be eligible for support.

The main comments given by business van owners about the funds included:

**Support the proposed funding / funding is needed to be able to conform / upgrade** (n=36): There was some support amongst van owners for the funds, and a further 11 reiterated the need for funding to cover all types of vehicles and be fair to all:

*“This will be massively welcomed. The cost of buying a new vehicle would put massive strain on our small business and would take years for us to have enough capital to purchase. Financial support would make this more realistic for us by 2022.” (Business, LGV)*

*“I think it is very important to support the smaller businesses and sole traders. We are going to need help with the new vehicles.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

**Unfair to those located outside the boundary / should be funding to those located outside the boundary but operate in GM:** Some concerns were raised (n=15) about the impact on those with businesses located just outside of the boundary but operate within it:

*“It should be extended to those outside GM that have to travel into GM. We enter an average of twice per week so would cost around £1000 to supply goods into Manchester.” (Business, LGV)*

**Just 17% (n= 27) thought the funding would meet their needs. The main reasons van owners’ needs would not be met included** [the comments below have been drawn from across the questionnaire]:

**Need more funding** (n= 67): A large proportion simply said they need more funding, with a further 10 stating they needed funding to cover 100% of the cost of the vehicle. A couple also stated the proposed funding does not consider other costs such as insurance and customisation (n=2):

*“£3.5k to purchase a new van. Have you tried purchasing a used LGV before, as this goes no way near the cost involved. My business can’t afford or justify the purchase of a much newer vehicle.” (Business, LGV)*

*“The price of electric vehicles might change over the next 2 years. If the second-hand market doesn’t increase, £3,500 would not help us to buy a brand-new electric vehicle.” (Business, LGV)*

*“Can’t get a euro class 6 vehicle that isn’t falling apart for the funds offered, can’t get or afford finance. Can’t even get a BBL because all lenders have locked it down to existing clients only” (Business, LGV)*

*“I purchased a van with a euro 5 engine last year for many £1000’s. The introduction of these charges would effectively reduce the value of my van to scrap value, (who would buy it?) Therefore, the grant offered towards a new van would nowhere near compensate for my loss.” (Business, LGV)*

**Financial support will not help** (n=15): Those with specialist vehicles did not feel the financial support would help as they could not easily change their vehicles regardless of the level of funding:

*“Because we are the last in the queue as a small business/partnership! We have the ideal van for our business purposes. This is no longer produced - shape has changed which reduces weight and load capacity. We have tried looking around for a replacement but cannot find one due to these requirements” (Business, LGV)*

*“it still requires too much investment from the business, our vehicles are not just vehicles, they have to have custom made fittings in the cargo area which can also run up to £3000-£4000 on top of the price of the vehicle, we cannot remove the systems from the old vehicles to the new. (Business, LGV)*

**Cannot afford to upgrade my vehicle/s** (n=86): Many said they could not afford the additional cost at the moment to upgrade, particularly due to the current situation and

uncertainty about future work (this is reported more in section 7.3 in relation to the impact of Covid-19):

*“Will you be providing a small business with a sufficient van? I only purchased my low mileage van this year so can't afford to go out and just buy or loan a new one. There's only 2 of us in our business and on limited work more than ever after this year we need help not a charge to pay.” (Business, LGV)*

*“I bought a brilliant used van for £6k with 25000 miles on the clock. It's 12 years old but provides the perfect solution for my business. Affordable, reliable and smart. I'd have to chip in at least an extra £10k IF I got a £5k grant. My business activities have been decimated by Covid already. We simply don't have the money - we have negotiated our rent and cut back on all costs possible to try and survive. A van upgrade is very unlikely. I have no money.” (Business, LGV)*

*“The money you are suggested is available is about 1/3 the cost of a new van. Selling my current vehicle would raise another couple of grand but to expect me to pay out £6000 of my own money in the next couple of years with the current loss of revenue is wrong.” (Business, LGV)*

Some predicted because of the devaluation of their current vehicles (n=19) and the expected increase in prices of compliant vehicles (n=16), they felt the gap in funding would be even greater.

**Queries about the fund:** Many comments referred to the uncertainty they felt about what they would be eligible for (n=80) and therefore, were unable to say whether it would meet their needs:

*“Presently we run 5 vans (NI) which would fall outside exemption rules due to area. From the consultation documents we understand we are eligible for £3,500 towards a compliant/newer vans. All our vans are modified for specific roles in roadside assistance, miss fuel drain, rapid deployment trailer. Could this type of van (not HGV) be exempt as would be a larger converted vehicle?” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

*“And if part of its, if the charges don't cover the funding, then where is the money for the funding coming from, is that central Government?” (Focus Group: LGV)*

*“If you're a scaffolder and you've got a twelve ton truck, that is your specialist HGV, because it saves you having a group of five lads hand boarding a load off. So what you define as specialist and what I define as a specialist is .... it's open to interpretation.” (Focus Group: HGV, LGV)*

## 6.5 The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Business HGV owners

Of responses from business, 143 had at least one HGV. Of which, 90% thought they would currently incur a charge when the CAZ is introduced. Under the proposals businesses with HGVs will be able to apply for a replacement grant of up to £16,000 towards retrofit to a compliant standard or a replacement grant which is dependent on vehicle size, the following funding amounts are proposed:

- 44t articulated up to £4,500 per vehicle
- 32t rigid up to £5,500 per vehicle
- 26t up to £4,500 per vehicle
- 18t up to £3,500 per vehicle

However, just 29% n=38 thought they were eligible for the fund even though the majority were based in Greater Manchester and therefore would be eligible for support.

The main comments given by HGV owners about the funds included:

**Support the proposed funding / funding is needed to be able to conform / upgrade:**

There was some support for the funding (n=15), with some re-iterating the need for it to be available to all (n=5):

*“Yes funding for HGV upgrade very welcome if it means no daily tax and is not repayable” (Business, HGV)*

*“As I will have to change my hgv and my van any finance aid would be welcomed” (Business, HGV, LGV)*

*“Welcome funding to help financially to up grade vehicle to become compliant.” (Business, HGV, LGV)*

**Funding should be higher for vehicles / provide a higher amount to those affected (n=22):** Several respondents in their comments strongly felt the amount should be increased. HGV owners heavily criticised the current proposed funding as being ‘inadequate’ and not sufficient to help buy replacement vehicles:

*“HGV funding is nowhere near enough. You are proposing a £5500 grant towards replacing a vehicle costing £50k upwards to replace. Leeds CAZ were granting £16000 per vehicle (we were granted £32000 towards the replacement of 2 vehicles) You are proposing a £16000 grant towards a retrofit solution. There are no such solutions available, so this is a meaningless offer.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

*“Regarding our line of work, I’ve been heavily involved in it, especially with the vehicles update, because one of our specialist vehicles, in excess of 250 tons, so the replacement vehicle we purchased last year actually came, I think it cost just under a quarter of a million pounds to replace one vehicle. So, you sit there and you look at it, obviously the ongoing extent is with the low emission zone come in and the reinvestment in equipment, just to keep it within this low emissions bracket, it does have quite a knock-on effect with obviously profit margins and everything else.” (Focus Group: HGV)*

The additional costs were mentioned, in particular insurance and modifying vehicles:

*“Insurance for electric commercial vehicles is a significant problem, there is only one insurer prepared to offer cover and it is exorbitant. This failure of the insurance market needs to be taken up by the Govt.” (Organisation, FSB)*

**Just 26% (n=10), thought the funding would meet their needs:** The main reasons HGV owners’ needs would not be met was the large gap between the proposed funding amount and the cost of a new vehicle (n=3). The devaluation (n=6) of current vehicles also added to the amount of funding they would need to be able to upgrade. Many said they cannot afford to upgrade their vehicle/s (n=29):

*“The cost of replacing the vehicles would leave me with a financial short fall of £35,500 for a second hand or £90,000 for brand new. ‘Up to’ £4500 is nowhere near enough.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

*“£5500 grant towards replacing a vehicle costing at least £50,000 is not a viable solution.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

## 6.6 The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Coach / minibus

Of responses from business, 70 had at least one Coach or Minibus. Of which, 89% thought they would currently incur a charge when the CAZ is introduced.

However, just 24% (n=15) thought they were eligible for the fund even though the majority were based in Greater Manchester and therefore would be eligible for support.

**Just 33% (n=5), thought the funding would meet their needs:** However, many of the responses from coach operators came via email or participation in the Focus Groups; how many said the proposed fund would or would not meet their needs cannot be quantified. Below is a summary of the response given from coach operators.

Several comments remarked on the criteria being unfair to the coach companies located outside the boundary and funding should also be provided to them. Reasons for extending the funding to outside the boundary included concerns of the impact to services without financial assistance:

*“We operate coaches into and out of GM to schools in Orrell, Leyland, and Macclesfield. The services only just cross the outer borders to either collect or deliver students and do not venture into the centre. Since we do not have a depot based within GM we believe this means we would not qualify for grant assistance. We would prefer it if this could be reconsidered as the effect on these services would be significant...” (Business, Coach, LGV)*

*“These proposals, set out in the consultation document, are comprehensive and detailed.... However, they unreasonably and unjustifiably discriminate against businesses operating into Greater Manchester from beyond the boundaries of Greater Manchester, and scheduled express coach operators in particular, who are neither eligible for a time-limited local exemption, or any financial support to comply. (Business, Coach)*

*“They’re doing the complete opposite than what is needed. They’re making it more expensive to go into Manchester in an environmentally friendly vehicle, but it’s Euro 4 or Euro 6, just by the sheer number of people we’d be carrying. I think the advantages to being in Greater Manchester are completely unfair to operators that are outside, you know, they’re getting an extra nine months, they’re getting the extra funding to do it and the nine months.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

Coach companies based outside GM highlighted they would be unlikely to invest, especially as they would not be entitled to support. Costs would have to be passed to customers and, therefore, they are likely to move business away from Greater Manchester. For example, some of the package day trips they offer to areas other than Manchester to maintain their competitiveness:

*“Well, I think from my point of view it’s penalising the people that are bringing revenue into the city. To all the businesses in the city that we bring people to, then it’s penalising those people, because we’re not going to do it, because I’m not going to invest in Euro 6 vehicles, not in the immediate future anyway, not at least in the immediate future, no way. Ultimately the passenger is going to pay the cost. You’re penalising operators outside of Manchester whilst giving them grants while they’re inside Manchester and extending the time limit for them. That’s unfair on the industry as a whole. Yeah and you’re devaluing everybody’s fleet, whether they’re in Manchester or they’re not, by bringing this in you are devaluing their fleet.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

*“And so, you know, if we say, oh, Manchester Christmas markets 460 or you can go to Liverpool market for 400. Bye bye Manchester.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

*“But there might be the issue that if they don’t want to pay, so you say to them it’s £200 to go to Chester, it’s £260 to go to Manchester, they’re just going to pick to go somewhere different. And so Manchester loses as well, doesn’t it, because they haven’t got the tourism coming in.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

A number of the coach and minibus operators in the focus groups felt the Fund will not go far enough to help them, especially in current circumstances. Most gave examples of the cost of a vehicle and the gap between the proposed funding and the cost of a new vehicle. Most did not feel they would be able to get the finance required to bridge the gap:

*“Well to give you an idea, a Euro 6 coach is £250,000, we have fourteen vehicles, that would be over £3 Million pounds and our annual turnover is £450,000, so you tell me how we’re supposed to do that?” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

*“We’re all really struggling at the minute, like everybody here with the Covid. I have spoken to my MP about this and they’ve offered us £16,500 which is nowhere near - where we’re supposed to get the rest of the money from.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

*“It’s £5,000 towards a minibus and to get a Euro 6 even a Ford Transit you’re looking at about £27,000 so £5,000 towards that is another £21,000 per vehicle times three, so it’s a big debt that you’re getting yourself into for the sake of earning not enough.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

There is also some mistrust if they did upgrade, the criteria could change again:

*“I’m thinking that currently Euro 6 it is, what’s the next step, do we go Euro 7, Euro 8? When do we get to the point where we’re not constantly improving air quality and they’re constantly passing costs on to smaller companies, because the major of wagon companies are quite large fleets. The majority of coach companies, there’s more small operators that run four or five, six or eight vehicles, where does it stop and ultimately, we as operators have to cover those costs, it has to come from somewhere and where it comes from is our customers.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

## 6.7 The Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Leisure vehicles and vans owned by the public

Under the proposals, members of the public who own a van or are owners or registered keepers of leisure vehicles (>3.5t) in private ownership, (e.g. motor caravan >3.5t), motorised horse box (>3.5t) would be subject to the daily charge if their vehicles are non-compliant.

They are therefore eligible to apply for funding via the Clean Commercial Vehicle fund.

Not all respondents detailed the type of vehicle they had, but of those we could identify, 262 had an affected vehicle, of which 95% thought they would be impacted by the clean air zone. However, just 16 thought they would be eligible for funding support; many lived outside the boundary, but many did not think they would be eligible because they are not a business.

**Just three respondents felt the funding would meet their needs:** The most commonly received comments from these groups were:

- **Funding needed for / concerns about funding for personal leisure vehicles e.g. campervans, horseboxes etc (n=70):** The comments centred around the cost of upgrading their vehicles. As with other affected, vehicles the devaluation on their current vehicle increases the amount of funds they need to secure:

*“Funding won’t go far enough. Not with specialist vehicles, because to me a horsebox is a specialist vehicle, you know, it’s not just a box, you know, there’s a lot of things that go into making that safe to transport up to three half ton animals at the end of the day.” (Focus Group: Public HGV owners)*

*“Looking at the second-hand value of non-compliant vehicle # 1 and the likely replacement cost of a compliant vehicle there is a significant gap. This is without taking into account that the proposals may lead to a drop in value of non-compliant vehicles and an increase in cost (due to supply issues) of compliant vehicles. With regard to non-compliant vehicle #2 this is a vehicle made by Land Rover special vehicle operations for West Yorks fire service and now in private ownership - A direct replacement (or similar) for this vehicle does not currently exist. There will be many businesses and publics in or close to the Manchester in a similar position.” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV, Private Car)*



- **Queries about the proposals / information not clear** (n=67): There was confusion amongst this group about the funding available as the following quote illustrates:

*“You are treating private campervans as commercial vehicles when it comes to charging but not compensating the owners of these vehicles to fund replacement vehicles which are much more expensive than commercial vehicles as they are specialist vehicles.” (Public, aged 55+ Other Vehicle)*

## 6.8 The Clean Taxi Fund – Hackney

In total, 165 respondents owned a hackney carriage. Of which, 84% thought they would incur a charge when the CAZ is introduced. Respondents were provided with a summary of the proposed financial support offered to hackneys through the Clean Taxi Fund, including the following grant levels:

- A grant of up to £10,000 will be available towards the running costs of a purpose-built wheelchair accessible zero emissions capable vehicle (ZEC); or
- Access to vehicle finance towards the cost of upgrade to a purpose-built wheelchair accessible ZEC vehicle, offering an average finance contribution of £10,000, with the total finance contribution capped at £14,000; or
- A grant of £5,000 towards the LPG retrofit of a Euro 5 vehicle less than ten years old will also be available.

75% (n=103) thought they were eligible for the fund.

The main comments received from hackney carriage drivers included:

**Support the proposed funding for Hackney carriages:** Some (n=10) expressed their general support for the funds and stressed their need for funding to be available to all (n=32):

*“Desperately Needed - you may end up with a vastly reduced fleet of vehicles.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“All help would be greatly appreciated.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“We need it badly as we have all been affected by this pandemic.” (Business, Hackney)*

**Funding should be higher for hackneys:** Nearly half of hackney respondents who commented felt funding should be higher (n=61), with some commenting they should be funded for the total cost of a hackney or provided with a compliant vehicle. Reasons for this included the high cost of upgrading to a compliant vehicle, which some felt would be prohibitive even with provision of financial support:

*“Definitely taxi trade need significantly more funds to meet the standards because this trade is completely dead at present time, we taxi drivers earning less than minimum wage. We taxi drivers really worried to keep our livelihood safe might we end up unemployment queues.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“The eligibility should be opened, and the fund increased to make it viable to continue as a hackney carriage driver. Currently it does not go far enough in supporting the drivers.” (Business, Hackney)*

**Should be support / reimbursement for those who have already upgraded:** There was concern amongst some hackney respondents the funding was unfair to those who had recently upgraded their vehicles. Six respondents commented there should be financial support or reimbursement available in such cases. Some felt those who had acted responsibly by adopting greener vehicles were being penalised:

*“I feel that this situation has been going on for quite some time and the uncertainty surrounding the trade and the clean air zone has added more pressure to an already horrendously pressurised job. I myself with this in mind and with the relevant*

*information at the time plumped for a Euro 6 vehicle when I changed my vehicle and feel I should be able to claim some funding back on this.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Subsidy has got to be available to early adopters as promised as we only upgraded due to the age or condition of our previous vehicle we should not be penalised for complying.” (Business, Hackney)*

**Electric Vehicles:** Although there were many comments in support of electric taxis, there was concern from some hackney respondents about the performance of electric vehicles (n=4) and availability of electric vehicle infrastructure (n=7):

*“Electric vehicles are nearly double the old vehicles and they are not affordable. The infrastructure for charging is non-existent, hence not yet ready for the switch.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“70,000 miles he said he’d done, and his batteries are goosed, and he didn’t realise how much the batteries were. It’s all right for 180 miles, then you get 160 miles and as the batteries start to die and get weaker and weaker you start getting electrical problems, you’re getting forty miles, fifty miles, you’ve got to replace them for new ones then. So that’s the problem with having electric vehicles on, good for the environment, but rubbish for the job, unless Tesla with their million-mile battery come along with a decent priced vehicle.” (Business PHV operator)*

**Just 19% (n=20) of Hackney Drivers felt the funding would meet their needs, and this is discussed more in section 6.9.1.**

## 6.9 The Clean Taxi Fund – PHV

In total, 201 respondents owned a private hire vehicle, of which 97% are licensed in Greater Manchester. Respondents were provided with a summary of the proposed financial support offered to PHVs through the Clean Taxi Fund, including the following grant levels:

### Private hire wheelchair accessible vehicle or minibus:

- A grant of £5,000 towards the cost of a compliant 6+ seater vehicle; or
- Access to vehicle finance, offering an average finance contribution of £5,000, with the finance contribution per vehicle capped at £7,000.

### Non-wheelchair accessible PHV:

- A grant of £1,000 towards the cost of a compliant internal combustion engine vehicle OR access to vehicle finance, offering an average finance contribution of £1,000, with the finance contribution per vehicle capped at £2,000; or
- A grant of £2,000 towards the cost of a compliant hybrid or plug-in hybrid; or
- Access to vehicle finance, offering an average finance contribution of £2,000, with the finance contribution per vehicle capped at £3,000; or
- A grant of £2,500 towards the running costs of a ZEC vehicle.

Half 54% (n=81) of PHV drivers thought they would be eligible for funding.

Respondents were asked if they had any comments on the proposed funds for PHVs. A total of 78 PHV drivers provided a comment.

**Support the proposed funding for PHV:** Some (n=19) expressed their general support for the funds and stressed their need for funding to be available to all (n=23):

*“We will definitely need financial support to change vehicles.” (Business, PHV)*

*“Yes, it is important to support private hire drivers to upgrade their vehicles.” (Business, PHV)*



**Funding should be higher for PHVs:** Over half (n=44) of PHV respondents felt the funding offer should be higher. Some felt they should be given the total cost of a replacement or provided with a compliant PHV vehicle:

*“If you want me to upgrade my vehicle to your standards then you have to support it reasonably so I can upgrade it, or it’s not going to be worth it, especially during this Covid crisis.” (Business, PHV)*

*“Funding has to be enough to cover the full cost of upgrading the vehicle, otherwise it’s not useful.” (Business, PHV)*

**Should be financial support for those who have already upgraded:** Of those who commented, four PHV respondents felt financial support or reimbursement should be available for those that have recently upgraded. Some felt the plans would otherwise be unfair to those who had already upgraded on their own accord:


*“I hope some help would be given to Private Hire owners who previously invested in low emission/ Hybrid vehicles. Being someone who purchased hybrid vehicles an increased expense it is getting harder to replace with the same as prices increase. I feel like I’m being penalised for purchasing my vehicles earlier than some owners.” (Business, PHV)*

**Half (51%) of PHV Drivers felt the funding would meet their needs.**

### 6.9.1 Would the Clean Taxi Fund meet Hackney and PHV needs?

About half (51%) of respondents considered themselves to be eligible for funding or the try before you buy scheme.


**Figure 6.1 Taxi drivers stating they could be eligible for funding (%)**



Base: all with taxi vehicles

Although half (51%) of PHV drivers thought the funding would meet their needs, only 20% of hackney drivers did. A high proportion did not know if the funding would meet their needs (30% and 44% respectively).

**Figure 6.2 Would the funding meet taxi driver needs (%)**



Base: All who own a taxi vehicle

**6.9.1.1 Reasons the funding will not meet taxi or PHV driver needs**

A total of 54 drivers responded to this question who owned a taxi, either a PHV or hackney. The main themes that emerged through the comments related to funding were queries about the funding or concerns it wasn't enough, and how the pandemic has impacted the future and the financial hardship they are currently experiencing. The main reasons respondents gave for their position are described in the following sections. The comments below have been drawn from across the questionnaire.

**Funding not enough:** Over a quarter of the comments stated the Clean Taxi Fund would not meet their financial needs as compliant vehicles were too expensive and the proposed funding too low. Some respondents were concerned the Clean Air Plan would result in increased demand for compliant vehicles, which would further increase vehicle costs.

Comments from Hackney drivers:

*“The funding of up to £17500 is not enough, new electric vehicles are rubbish, there is not enough work in the trade to justify paying these prices.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“To replace my vehicle with a CAZ compliant one at the present time would cost me £25000. To go fully electric without taking a drop in the standard of my vehicle would cost £60000. Offering £5 -10K doesn't cut it.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Vehicle Suitability of electric vehicles is not the main issue. It's cost and running costs and charge points.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Funding is not enough, and the monthly payments will not be affordable.” (Organisation, Tameside Owners & Drivers Association)*

*“If somebody offered me 10 grand to go and buy a new vehicle I wouldn't accept it, because you're still looking at £30,000 finance, do you know what I mean, £30-40,000 finance.” (Depth interview: Hackney driver).*

Comments from PHV drivers:

*"If the Government allows a less than [sic] 5 year old private hire car then they should support more because £1000 for private hire is nothing. New cars are very expensive. No one can afford by himself. So the Government should increase the funds and also arrange financing for easy monthly payments." (Business, PHV)*

*"These proposals will kill the trade. Drivers cannot afford the cost of implementing these changes. ". The public will pay more for this and under the current financial climate, it will deter the public to use taxis. Provide drivers £10000 grant and government needs to make a deal with manufacturers of vehicles to provide taxi drivers 0% interest to purchase compliant vehicles." (Business, PHV)*

**Financial Hardship:** Around a fifth of respondents commented on financial hardship that would result from the CAZ. Whilst the proposed funds provide some financial help, it does not cover the full cost of a compliant vehicle and the outstanding amount required to cover the rest of the vehicle would put the respondent into financial hardship:

*"We the Hackney drivers cannot afford the new vehicle due to the fact we do not earn enough to make the relevant payments for a new vehicle. This is unsustainable." (Business, Hackney)*

*"Because I would still need to go into more debt than I am already in and it will push me nearer to the edge that I am already teetering on." (Business, PHV)*

Other respondents commented they already have loans for their current vehicles and could not afford to pay the loan that would be associated with a new compliant taxi:

*"I've struggled for the past 3 years to pay finance on a 25k loan, which I took out to upgrade my vehicle in the hope it would be a long time investment. Now your [sic] asking me to ditch my vehicle and take out another loan for 40k." (Business, Hackney)*

*"I have already loan on my current vehicle. The new vehicle is well beyond my reach. I am unlikely to get through the Covid19 crisis with a damage to my credit history. There is no business and I am falling behind. With this credit history and low or no business how in heavens I am going to get a loan to buy a cab. You have to go extra mile to get this." (Business, Hackney)*

*"I am not sure we need this massive change. We have another lockdown upon us, taxi and private hire drivers are at the edge of extinction. We definitely don't need these life changing extra expenses. My car has an outstanding finance till 2024. What will I do? will you pay my remaining finance?" (Business, PHV)*

Some commented there would be decreased residual value in their existing non-compliant vehicle, making it even harder to afford a new vehicle:

*"I am still paying finance on my current vehicle and couldn't afford to upgrade until this is paid off. However, the fact that my vehicle is Euro5 means that it's trade in value has been heavily reduced by the CAZ plans meaning its even less likely that I will be able to upgrade to a compliant vehicle before the proposed MLS age limit. This means that I will probably be driving a non compliant vehicle for longer than I originally planned due to the CAZ - isn't this counterproductive?" (Business, Hackney)*

**Impact of Covid-19:** Nearly a fifth of those who commented mentioned the impact of Covid-19 on the taxi trade and increased hardship caused by the current economic climate. Some felt their future is uncertain, and the financial pressure added by the Clean Air Plan proposals would cause debt or could put them out of business:

*"Due to Covid and the reduced business levels, the Taxi trade is currently not viable. Any attempt to introduce this scheme at the present time will further undermine the viability of the trade." (Business, Hackney)*

*“Unprecedented times. Current economic and health crisis has changed the way we work. The hospitality and leisure sectors have been severely impacted. Drivers incomings and outgoings have not been assessed or explored. Debt, finance issues etc. Sacha Lord Manchester’s Night Time Economy adviser also states that this sector has been setback by at least 5 years, which has had a knock on effect to all other sectors. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-england-manchester-54973568>” (Business, PHV)*

*“Taxi trade future is not good at present due to pandemic.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Not enough work to finance these vehicles and make a living.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Not enough work in Manchester city centre for hackney carriages at the moment.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“There is no business trade now. Everyone is working from home. All the big offices, no one there. All been done online so there is no business trade, not like there used to be.” (Licensed private hire driver – own my vehicle, Tameside)*

*“It’s just at a standstill, really, there’s no work available, because of Covid, because everything’s all closed and it’s very, very hard to make a living now.” (Depth interview: private hire driver/owner)*

Some respondents felt the fund wasn’t enough, due to the pandemic, but also because of longer-term problems like the rise in the popularity of Uber:

*“The proposed support is not enough we are coming out of a pandemic highly effected financially. If any of the PHV drivers had any savings they have gone through it so they definitely should be provided ample support.” (Business, PHV)*

*“We are suffering as black cab driver since UBER came we lost a lot of work now because of Covid 19 there is no work waiting time is 2 hours or above minimum for a fare the funding the idea is not the best time clean air zero emissions this the worst time taxis are facing. The funding is not enough.” (Business, Hackney)*

**Electric Vehicles:** Other notable comments include respondents highlighting concerns associated with having an electric taxi vehicle, including the range, reliability, and access to charging for such vehicles:

*“The LEVC taxi only covers 40 miles on a charge this is far too low to use as a taxi” (Business, Hackney)*

*“An EV would not be practical for me because I don’t have a charging point at my home.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“I wouldn’t be able to charge my electric vehicle” (Business, PHV)*

## 6.10 Management of Funds

The consultation documents stated:

**Clean Bus Fund:** If the fund is oversubscribed by the deadline, it is proposed that, in addition to applicants meeting the eligibility criteria, an additional process could be applied that seeks to prioritise air quality benefits, i.e. funding could initially be targeted towards the upgrade of the oldest vehicles first.

**Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund:** It is proposed that financial support, subject to available funds, will be available through sequential funding rounds. These would target funding towards individuals and the smallest businesses within GM and would be initially directed towards those who are likely to be most economically vulnerable to the impacts of the GM CAZ. The proposed funding rounds are set out below:

- An initial round of funding will be open to eligible owners or registered keepers of a non-compliant vehicle of Euro VI standard or older, with the exception of small businesses.
- A second round of funding would be open to eligible owners or registered keepers of a non-compliant vehicle, with the exception of small businesses.
- Subject to available funds, a third round of funding would be open to eligible owners or registered keepers of a non-compliant vehicle, including small businesses.

**Clean Taxi Fund:** It is proposed that funding will be offered on a first come first served basis, once an applicant had evidenced that the eligibility criteria are met.

All respondents were asked to give any comments about the proposed management of the bus, commercial and taxi funds.

### 6.10.1 Public without affected vehicle and representatives

Most of the comments received referred to the prioritisation of the funds particularly the bus fund. Comments about the operation of the scheme were also raised.

**Table 6-3 Comments on the management of funds**

	Clean Bus Fund (CBF)	Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (CCVF)	Clean Taxi Fund (CTF)
Support the fund	47	50	57
Prioritisation of fund	319	282	161
Operation of the scheme	144	141	242
Miscellaneous	60	56	28
<b>Base</b>	<b>509</b>	<b>461</b>	<b>387</b>

### 6.10.1.1 Support the management of funds

There were very few supporting comments about the management of the funds:

	Clean Bus Fund (CBF)	Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (CCVF)	Clean Taxi Fund (CTF)
Support the proposed management of funding / eligibility criteria	47	50	57

Examples of general supportive comments about all the funds include:

*“Sensible and vitally important to make (sustainable) bus travel the go to public transport mode for the region.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“I think this is an appropriate way to manage the [commercial] funds and makes the most sense / will benefit the most in-need businesses.” (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*“I think the proposed management of the [taxi] funds is the correct approach.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

### 6.10.1.2 Prioritisation of funds

Members of the public without an affected vehicle felt the funds should be prioritised:

	Clean Bus Fund (CBF)	Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (CCVF)	Clean Taxi Fund (CTF)
Funds should be prioritised for older vehicles / most polluting / where change will have greatest impact	245	41	67
Funds should be prioritised for sole traders / small businesses / small organisations	30	134	26
Funding should go to those who need it most/should be means tested	34	43	74
Prioritisation of funding should depend on proposal impact on business / organisation	10	24	0
Funds should be prioritised for those who upgrade to electric / hybrid vehicles	10	3	7
Funds should be prioritised for voluntary / community organisations / charities / services	11	94	0
Funds should be prioritised for those who have already recently upgraded their vehicle/s / should be reimbursed	8	5	3
Older vehicles are not necessarily the most polluting / should not focus on oldest vehicles	34	0	0
Funds should be prioritised for buses / vehicles carrying the most passengers	13	0	0
Equal amount of funding should be allocated to each district of GM	0	0	8
<b>Base</b>	<b>319</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>161</b>

**Funds should be prioritised for older vehicles / most polluting / where change will have greatest impact** (CBF n=245; CCVF n=41; CTF n=67): This was the most common response from the respondents without an impacted vehicle with regards to the management of bus funds. Responses mainly remarked on removing the most polluting and / or oldest buses from the road to improve air quality, irrespective of the size of the business:

*“The [bus] operators should be encouraged to replace the oldest vehicles.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“The oldest most polluting buses should be taken off the road by late 2022.” (Public, prefer not to say age, Private Car)*

*“I think it's still best to prioritise the oldest/worst polluting [commercial] vehicles, regardless of the size of the business.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“Vehicles generating the highest pollution (presumed to be the oldest) to be retired first, either via subsidies or stopping re-registration as taxis / private hire.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

**Funds should be prioritised for sole traders / small businesses / small organisations** (CBF n=30; CCVF n=134; CTF n=26): Respondents without impacted vehicles stressed the importance of the commercial funding being prioritised for sole traders, small businesses and small organisations due to being less able to afford a compliant vehicle:

*“I think that the self-employed and small businesses should be considered as priority for [commercial] financial support.” (Public, aged 34-54, No Vehicle)*

*“As I said before I don't think public funds should fully pay for any requirements. If they have to be used then they should subsidise funds from the businesses. Smaller, independent [bus] operators should be prioritised over larger national companies.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

Additionally, some respondents also emphasised the importance of this funding for smaller businesses due to the impact of Covid-19 and how it will help their recovery. The impact of Covid-19 on businesses is discussed in Section 7:

*“Access to these [commercial] funds are essential for such businesses especially during a recovery period following the coronavirus pandemic.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Small businesses will definitely need the [commercial] support, particularly after the economic hit of Covid-19.” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

**Funding should go to those who need it most / should be means tested** (CBF n=34; CCVF n=43; CTF n=74): Some comments, especially the taxi funds, argued funding should go towards those who need the greatest amount of financial support with some representatives also emphasising it might not necessarily be reflected in the size of the business:

*“The distribution of [taxi] funds should take account of impact, not just first come first served.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Financial support should be available to those who need it most and would not be able to continue without it.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Those who are providing the most needed services should be first on the list. IE bus services on less popular routes that are essential for the elderly.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Finance should be focussed on a stronger economic model than smallest business first, it should be weighted on financial impact and social impact.” (Organisation, The Old Courts Wigan)*

*“Not necessarily just because they are small doesn’t mean they have less money it should be done based on lowest turnover.” (Councillor / Elected Official)*

**Funds should be prioritised for voluntary / community organisations / charities / services** (CBF n=11; CCVF n=94): Respondents made reference to their importance in the community as well as potentially not having the ‘capacity to complete complex funding arrangements’:

*“[Commercial] financial support should be available to charitable or voluntary organisations first and then small businesses.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Prioritise [commercial funding for] businesses and organisations that make a positive contribution to their community, especially charities and voluntary groups.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Financial support should be available primarily to VCSE and small independent businesses. It should be made very easy for them to apply. Small businesses and charities do not have capacity to complete complex funding arrangements.” (Organisation, Farnworth Baptist Church)*

### 6.10.1.3 Operation of the scheme

Comments about how the funds would be managed included:

**Mismanagement and transparency of the funding** (CBF n=81; CCVF n=70; CTF n=78): Several responses expressed their apprehensions surrounding how all the funds will be managed and called for full transparency. In terms of transparency, respondents stated the decisions of how and where the funding is being distributed should be ‘open to public view and scrutiny’ as well as being audited. Furthermore, several respondents voiced their disapproval of local governing bodies and did not believe the funding would be effectively managed by them:

*“This has to be managed carefully, because certain [bus] operators like stagecoach and first have a lot of vehicles so it would make sense for enough funding to be available to go around every operator no matter how big or small. It’s often the smaller operators that have older vehicles because of the replacement costs so they should not be forgotten.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“Again, I don’t trust the proposed management of [commercial] funds with schemes like this because they tend to have a habit of money being wasted or money disappearing and it’s usually by the people who are so heavily involved with the scheme.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“It (Commercial fund) should be closely monitored with full audit trail and absolute transparency.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Be transparent about who gets [Taxi] funding. Every last penny. Account for it. Publicly.” (Public, aged 45-54, Private Car)*

*“Management expenses and costs should be open to public view and scrutiny.” (Organisation, Anonymous)*

**Fraud / Abuse of the scheme** (CBF n=56; CCVF n=43; CTF n=97): There were concerns from respondents about the scheme (especially the Clean Taxi Fund) being misused, with comments stating it could be used to increase businesses incomes, as well as fraud by fake applications and businesses:

*“Be aware of the potential for fraud [bus fund]. Will vehicles benefitting from it remain in the GM area? Could retrofitted buses be moved out of the area and older vehicles moved in, so that they could claim more retrofitting? etc.” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*



*“I worry about abuses to the [commercial fund] system. Businesses are adept at maximising their income by fair means and some by foul.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“I expect a close definition of businesses able to claim on any such [commercial] fund with strict anti-fraud measures and harsh punishments for anyone convicted of fraud.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Funds are by there [sic] nature, subject to fraud. By the time you have finished, everyone in Greater Manchester will own a taxi.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

**Concerns about larger companies accounting for / receiving the majority of the funds available** (CBF n=24; CCVF n=37; CTF n=18): Some comments were concerned about larger companies being able to apply and also receive bus and commercial funding:

*“I think it's important to ensure large companies aren't receiving an excessive amount of the [bus] funding, e.g. [name of company]. Perhaps also allotting funding based on company size might also be beneficial.” (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*“Big companies should not qualify for a [commercial] fund, the fund should be dedicated to the small, independent businesses.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Whilst first come first served might seem fair, in reality, larger businesses are more likely to be better organised and have other staff to make these applications. Whereas smaller one-man band types would easily miss these [Taxi fund] schemes, and then by the time these types of businesses realise, the funding could be all gone. Smaller businesses will more likely struggle to make these charges, and should be helped before larger firms with better profit ratio.” (Public, aged 55+, No Vehicle)*

**Fund needs to be well advertised** (CBF n=3; CCVF n=6; CTF n=23): Some members of the public commented the taxi fund in particular needs to be well-advertised to ensure those affected are aware of the opportunity to apply for funding:

*“If it is to be on a first-come-first-served basis, there needs to be a very robust communication strategy in place to ensure that access to [Taxi] funds is fair and equitable. Affected drivers need to be communicated with about the CAZ, arguing the need for it and telling them of their rights. The communications strategy needs to be multi layered and diverse to reach drivers of affected vehicles especially small businesses, sole traders entitled to exemptions and financial help. It needs to reach into all the diverse communities across Greater Manchester in different languages. A digital by default strategy won't reach all the target audience. GMCA needs to prepare the ground by reaching into communities to find out what works. One of the messages re the need for the scheme should be the impact of NO<sub>2</sub> on drivers. Being in vehicle doesn't protect you, also the impact of NO<sub>2</sub> on your family, friends and neighbours.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

## 6.10.2 Management of the Bus Fund – Bus operators

Respondents were asked if they had any comments on the management of the Clean Bus Fund. In total, only 10 business respondents with buses provided a comment.

**Funds should be prioritised for older vehicles / most polluting / where change will have greatest impact** (n=4): Respondents felt funding should be prioritised for these vehicles in order to improve air quality most effectively, with these comments being shared particularly by those who had concerns about the amount of funding not being enough:

*“Older vehicles should be modernised first.” (Public, Bus, Coach)*

**Concerns about larger companies accounting for / receiving the majority of the funds available** (n=3): Concerns were raised about large operators receiving the fund saying it should go to those who needed it the most:

*“Funds should go to the operators who need the help most. either the oldest vehicles or the operators most at risk to suffer financial difficulties due to this.” (Business, Bus, Coach, LGV)*

### 6.10.3 Management of the Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Van owners

Respondents were asked if they had any comments on the management of the Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund. In total, 90 business respondents with vans provided a comment. The most commonly received comments from this group were:

**Funds should be prioritised for sole traders / small businesses / small organisations** (n=36): This was the most common response from business respondents who own a van, who stressed the importance of funding being prioritised for sole traders, small businesses and small organisations due to being less able to afford a compliant vehicle:

*“Yes as a small business I would definitely want smaller firms that are likely struggling the most yet expected to buy a new van or other vehicle...helped out first.” (Business, LGV)*

*“Small businesses, sole traders and partnerships with an income under a threshold should be eligible, with greater priority to those who also rely on tax credits to supplement their income.” (Business, LGV)*

*“I would agree with smaller business / sole traders being first as they have less profit & turnover and are less likely to afford a new vehicle as big businesses.” (Business, LGV)*

**Concerns about larger companies accounting for / receiving the majority of the funds available** (n=10): Some comments made by van owners were concerned about larger companies being able to apply for and also receive funding:

*“Needs to help those that most need it. Not huge companies who can afford it. Should be done off your tax return with low earners given priority.” (Business, LGV)*

*“Totally agree. We should help those most at risk of losing their livelihoods before those who are big enough to write off the upgrades against profit.” (Business, LGV)*

**Funds should be prioritised for older vehicles / most polluting / where change will have greatest impact** (n=9): Responses from van owners mainly remarked on removing the most polluting and / or oldest vehicles from the road to improve air quality, irrespective of the size of the business:

*“If the aim is really to reduce pollution shouldn't it be aimed at the most polluting businesses first and the smaller, less polluting businesses remain exempt.” (Business, LGV)*

*“Financial support should be available for the replacement of oldest vehicles first. Size of operator should not matter.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

**Concerns about the funding being mismanaged / needs to be a transparent process** (n=7): Several responses expressed their apprehension surrounding how the fund will be managed and called for full transparency. A number of respondents also voiced their disapproval of local governing bodies and did not believe the funding would be effectively managed by them:

*“I have every confidence that they will be adequately mismanaged.” (Business, LGV, Other vehicle)*

*“Will probably be mismanaged like everything else GMC does.” (Business, LGV)*

**Support the proposed management of funding / eligibility criteria** (n=7): Some comments from van owners were in support of the funding. Respondents mainly used words including ‘agree’, ‘good’ and the support was needed:

*“That would be a great help.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

#### 6.10.4 Management of the Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – HGV owners

In total, 30 business respondents with HGVs provided a comment. The most commonly received comments from this group were:

**Funds should be prioritised for sole traders / small businesses / small organisations** (n=10): This was the most common response from respondents who own an HGV, who stressed the importance of funding being prioritised for sole traders, small businesses and small organisations due to being less able to afford a compliant vehicle:

*“It is going to be essential for the smaller businesses to get help or a lot of them won’t survive.” (Business, HGV, LGV)*

*“I’d say that 90+% of the large operators of HGVs in and around Manchester have already upgraded their fleet (due to normal financial fleet practices). Companies like mine need to be prioritised by any financial schemes available.” (Business, HGV, LGV)*

**Support the proposed management of funding / eligibility criteria** (n=5): Some comments from HGV owners were in support of the funding. Respondents mainly used words including ‘agree’, ‘good’ and the support was needed.

#### 6.10.5 Management of the Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Coach / minibus

Respondents were asked if they had any comments on the management of the Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund. Only nine business respondents with coaches or minibuses provided a comment. The most commonly received comments from this group were:

**Funds should be prioritised for sole traders / small businesses / small organisations** (n=6): Respondents stressed the importance of funding being prioritised for sole traders, small businesses and small organisations due to being less able to afford a compliant vehicle:

*“Smallest first to avoid the huge companies getting money first.” (Business, Minibus, PHV)*

Concerns were raised the bus fund is not available for operators who operate within GM but are based elsewhere.

*“We note that the Councils have applied to Government for a significant sum to help locally-based businesses and organisations with non-compliant vehicles address the financial costs of compliance. These proposals, set out in the consultation document, are comprehensive and detailed. However they unreasonably and unjustifiably discriminate against businesses operating into Greater Manchester from beyond the boundaries of Greater Manchester, and scheduled express coach operators in particular, who are neither eligible for a time-limited local exemption, or any financial support to comply.” (Business, Coach)*

## 6.11 Management of the Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund – Leisure Vehicles

Respondents were asked if they had any comments on the management of the Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund. In total, 90 respondents with leisure vehicles provided a comment. The most commonly received comments from this group were concerns for small businesses and sole traders:

**Funds should be prioritised for sole traders / small businesses / small organisations (n=29) and funding should go to those who need it most / should be means tested (n=8):** Respondents stressed the importance of funding being prioritised for sole traders, small businesses and small organisations due to being less able to afford a compliant vehicle. Some comments argued funding should go to those which need the greatest amount of financial support:

*“Small businesses should get help first as they’re likely to struggle with the increase of price.” (Public, aged 18-34, Leisure HGV, HGV, PHV, Private Car,)*

*“Smaller businesses tend to have less capital available for vehicle replacement and should have financial support.” (Public, aged 55+, Leisure HGV, Private Car)*

*“You should support the ones you are risking closure too. I hope there is enough in the unemployment pot.” (Public, aged 35-54, Leisure HGV)*

*“Agree that businesses with the greatest need should be prioritised.” (Public, aged 18-34, Leisure HGV)*

**Support the proposed management of funding / eligibility criteria (n=7):** Only a few respondents who own a leisure LGV or HGV supported the management of the clean commercial fund. Respondents used words including ‘agree’, ‘good’ and specifically highlighted the importance of helping the ‘most in need businesses’:

*“Agree that businesses with the greatest need should be prioritised.” (Public, aged 18-34, Leisure LGV)*

**Concerns about the funding being mismanaged / needs to be a transparent process (n=7):** Several responses expressed their apprehension surrounding how the commercial fund will be managed and called for full transparency:

*“Should be transparent so all can see how much and where the money is being spent.” (Public, aged 55+, Leisure HGV)*

## 6.12 Management of the Clean Taxi Fund – Hackney, PHV

Respondents were asked if they had any comments on the management of the Clean Taxi Fund. In total, 88 hackney and PHV drivers provided a comment. The most commonly received comments from these groups were:

**Oppose proposed first-come-first-serve approach / is unfair (Hackney n=21; PHV n=14):** Drivers opposed this approach or felt it was unfair. Some thought first-come-first-served could risk disproportionately benefiting those who are already engaged with the system, whilst those on the periphery are missed:

*“Stupid idea. The people who will come first will be the ones who have some savings (who have multiple cabs and rent them out) and they try and save more with the government fund. Those who are struggling to pay their bills will leave it as late as possible to save as much money as they can but by then the fund would’ve finished. There are garages who own 30 or 40 plates and Hackney Carriage vehicles and so they will use up all the fund.” (Business, Hackney)*

**Support the proposed management of funding / eligibility criteria** (Hackney n=2; PHV n=8): More PHV respondents commented on supporting the funds than Hackney respondents.

*“First-come-first-served sounds good.” (Business, PHV)*

However, some commented whilst first-come-first-served was a fair method of distribution, it was important there was enough funding for latecomers:

*“We agree with the first-come-first served basis, but it should be guaranteed that they are not going to turn around to the latter people and say they have run out of money. Also there should not be a heavy admin burden on drivers, keep red tape to a minimum.” (Business, PHV)*

**Funds should be prioritised for older vehicles** (Hackney n=6; PHV n=3): Some thought funds should be prioritised for older, more polluting vehicles or where change would have the greatest impact:

*“It would make sense to give the drivers of older, dirtier vehicles first option. Why not introduce a longer exemption period for Euro 5 vehicles meaning the dirtiest vehicles get replaced first?” (Business, Hackney)*

*“I believe the older vehicles should be helped first before the likes of Euro 5 engine vehicles are helped.” (Business, Hackney)*

**Funding should go to those who need it most / should be means tested** (Hackney n=3; PHV n=4): Some commented funding should go to those who need it most or it should be means tested:

*“Yes. Abuse or misuse of the application process and or funds by certain individuals or organisations. First-come-first-served is not always necessarily the fairest option. May need to be assessed on a case by case basis and on merit subject to eligibility and possibly a further review if needed.” (Business, PHV)*

## 6.13 Try Before You Buy

Respondents were provided with a summary of the proposed Try Before You Buy initiative:

**To tackle the barriers to switching to electric vehicles, GM is proposing a “Try Before You Buy” initiative for GM-licensed hackney drivers. The opportunity to hire and assess the vehicle before making an investment should help to address identified uncertainties about operating costs, range anxiety and availability of charging infrastructure.**

They were then asked if they had any comments on the proposed initiative. The key themes emerged from the comments are summarised in Table 6-4 Comments on Try Before You Buy. Very few comments were received from the public. A quarter of representative and a fifth of businesses commented.

**Table 6-4 Comments on Try Before You Buy**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Support the scheme	182	56	19
Oppose the scheme	96	35	7
Operation of the scheme	7	3	0
Concerns	17	4	2
Miscellaneous	192	84	10
<b>Base</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>31</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	12	21	25

### 6.13.1 Support the scheme

Just over a third of businesses and members of the public gave a supportive comment and three quarters of representatives who commented were supportive of the scheme.

	General public	Business (excl. Taxis)	Representatives	Hackney	PHV
Support the try before you buy scheme	180	19	19	17	15
Try before you buy should be available for other vehicles	3	5	0	0	2
<b>Base</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>15</b>

Of the comments received, two fifths of respondents left comments in support of the Try Before You Buy scheme or suggested the scheme would help drivers get a better idea of vehicles and capabilities (public n=180; business n=19; representative n=19). Some thought the scheme could help to overcome anxieties surrounding electric vehicle technology and encourage more drivers to convert to electric:

*“As a proven sales technique in many sectors, I believe this would help significantly accelerate low emission vehicle uptake. It is widely reported that range anxiety is one of the biggest contributors to a lack of low emission vehicle adoption. Investment in*



*EV infrastructure would provide more consumer confidence.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“It makes sense because there is a lot of undue concern about the suitability of hybrid or electric vehicles and trying them will alleviate the concerns.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

17 Hackney drivers expressed interest in the scheme.

*“I would be interested in the try before you buy scheme.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“I have already bought an EV and hence this policy wasn’t available to me. But the initiative is a good one for future buyers” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Yes will try the different vehicles that are available” (Business, Hackney)*

Representatives voiced support for the scheme given it is provided alongside sufficient financial support to enable upgrade to electric vehicles.

*“Members feel that this is a good idea if it sits within a comprehensive package of measures. There’s no point in it if the electric option is financially non-viable, as it is currently is under the suggested proposals.” (Organisation, Unite the Union)*

Although the Try Before You Buy scheme is only intended for hackney drivers, other sectors thought it would be useful if an equivalent scheme was established for other vehicle types. Of those who commented, five businesses and two PHV respondents suggested the Try Before you Buy scheme should be extended to other vehicle types, including PHVs and LGVs:

*“Great idea. an equivalent for vans would be even better, as there are many more of these impacted.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“It is always a good thing to try before you buy. PHV drivers should given the opportunity to try before you buy.” (Business, PHV)*

### 6.13.2 Oppose the scheme

A few did not agree with the scheme:

	General public	Business (excl. Taxis)	Representatives	Hackney	PHV
Oppose the try before you buy scheme	81	20	6	8	7
Scheme is not needed should upgrade to electric vehicles	16	0	1	0	0
<b>Base</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>7</b>

Some respondents had reservations about the scheme and made comments in opposition (public n=81; business – excluding taxis n=19; representatives n=6, hackney n=8; PHVs n=7) feeling the package was not enough to incentivise uptake:

*“Try before you buy. Why would I rent a vehicle when I already own a perfectly serviceable vehicle? If you wish to encourage drivers to buy into it then the package needs to be far more lucrative.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“I can’t see many drivers opting into that. No sense. We have enough going on without taking a scheme like that on.” (Depth Interview: Hackney driver).*

Others felt the scheme was unnecessary or a waste of money, as hackney drivers would have to upgrade anyway:



*“Seems pointless. Everyone will have to upgrade, and the move to electric will happen anyway. Businesses will just be wanting to avoid the costs of not complying. Put the money in to the finance package to make it more generous.” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

*“I think that businesses ought to be self-sufficient and knowledgeable enough not to need such an initiative” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

### 6.13.3 Concerns about the scheme

The following concerns were raised by a few respondents:

	General public	Business (excl. Taxis)	Representatives	Hackney	PHV
Concerns about where funding is coming from	9	1	1	2	0
Concern about people abusing it	10	1	1	0	0
<b>Base</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>

Some respondents left comments which suggested concern about where the funding to support the Try Before You Buy scheme would come from (public n=9; Hackney n=2):

*“And how much will that cost? Why not just only allow electric taxis to be used entirely - by buying a fleet and maintaining it. You seem to want to spend billions. MADNESS.” (Public aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Cost effectiveness should be demonstrated before wasting tax payers money” (Business, Hackney)*

There was also concern from some members of the public the scheme would be open to abuse (n=10):

*“Opportunity to hire and assess the vehicle's sounds vague. It must be for a short, defined period otherwise people will learn to manipulate the scheme.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

### 6.13.4 Queries about the scheme

	General public	Business (excl. Taxis)	Representatives	Hackney	PHV
Queries about the proposals / information not clear	144	30	2	10	4

Several respondents were unclear on the detail of the scheme and made comments querying how the scheme would work, eligibility and costs of the scheme (public, n=144; business excluding taxis, n=30; and hackney, n=10, PHV, n=4):

*“Further information is needed on this regarding the eligibility and how this will work.” (Business, Hackney)*

### 6.13.5 Other – Electric Vehicle Performance

Several comments were received about electric vehicles and the available infrastructure:

	General public	Business (excl. Taxis)	Representatives	Hackney	PHV
Concerns about the lack of electric charging infrastructure	11	1	0	1	0
Electric vehicles are too expensive / unaffordable to upgrade	8	4	4	17	6
Concerns about performance of electric hackneys	3	1	1	0	1
Concerns about availability of electric vehicles	4	1	0	1	1
<b>Base</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>8</b>

Some respondents voiced concerns about the performance of electric hackneys (public n=3; business excluding taxi n=1) and availability of electric vehicle charging points (public, n=11; hackney, n=1). Some felt without sufficient electric charging infrastructure in place, the scheme would not help to alleviate fears around electric vehicle technology:

*“Its sounds good but I don’t think it will work in the real world as batteries degrade overtime and will cause issues with recycling” (Business, PHV)*

*“Great idea but the infrastructure needs to be in place ASAP. What are you doing about the thousands of people that live on terraced streets, how are me going to charge vehicles?” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“I expect that range anxiety would be a real concern, however the success of this scheme will be dependent on the availability of charging infrastructure. How will charging work? I anticipate that taxi drivers will need to charge during working hours, however will there be a charger available in a convenient location? Will there be enough so that there will always be one available when they attend to charge up? This won’t work if there is a queue of taxis waiting for few chargers, it would take out too much of their working day waiting hours to charge.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“I mean I’d more than look at hybrids to start off. I wouldn’t go all electric, because the facilities to charge for a taxi, whether you like it or not you do twelve hour shifts and then it jumps to someone else to do another twelve hour shift, so the car’s doing a twenty four hour shift every day, but it needs to be maintained, looked after and charged and at the moment there’s no places to charge, not enough places to charge them.” (Depth Interview: Hackney driver)*

*“I know a two-year-old electric car, it needs batteries already and it’s costing him £1200 and he wished he’s never bought it now.” (Depth Interview: Hackney driver)*

*“Actually there are particular issues for electric vehicles for disabled people, because they don’t have any noise and therefore if you don’t understand that there might be deaf and hard of hearing people, children and people with learning difficulties or dementia that might not actually see the electric, you know, be aware of the electric vehicle, you need to have a much more stringent driving standards.” (Focus Group: Disabled Hackney/PHV user)*

Some also raised concerns with the cost of electric and felt upgrading is unaffordable to many hackney drivers (public n=8; business n=27; representatives n=4). This view was held by a third of the hackney respondents:

*"No ..... it's not that I don't think it's good for the environment although an electric car will not be something very nice to drive my objection to purchasing one is I would not be able to afford the repayment and to keep it on the road" (Business, Hackney)*

*"Vehicles are heavily overpriced. Any funds would increase the prices further." (Business, Hackney)*

*"It's not the trying the vehicle it's the amount it is to buy one" (Business, Hackney)*

*"To buy an electric vehicle you're looking at 56,000. Now, if you want to put that in perspective I own 19,000 on my mortgage, that 19,000 will have me working, I am working now by twenty hours, so where's the decision, where do you make the decision on that? Do you saddle yourself up with 50,000? The Government, even if they offer, I think they're thinking at the moment it's 10 grand, they're looking at offering 10 grand, you're still looking at £46,000, do you know what I mean?" (Depth Interview: Hackney driver)*

*"A brand-new electric cab, the bottom end is £55,000. So even if they gave you £17,500 towards one of those vehicles, you're saddling somebody with a debt of almost £30,000." (Depth Interview: Hackney driver)*

## 6.14 Vehicle finance offer

The vehicle finance offer was introduced to all respondents in the questionnaire as follows:

**A Greater Manchester appointed panel of finance providers will work alongside the Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund and Clean Taxi Fund to offer eligible owners of a non-compliant vehicle the option of either a lump sum grant or a finance contribution towards vehicle finance to help them upgrade to a compliant vehicle.**

Over a third of businesses commented on the vehicle finance offer, as did a third of representatives and a fifth of the public. There was a polarised view of the proposed finance offer; a third of comments were supportive stating it was vital to helping businesses upgrade to compliant vehicles. However, a third of comments were negative raising concerns it could lead to increased debt for those receiving loans, putting increased pressure on businesses.

**Table 6-5 Comments about the Vehicle Finance Offer**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Support the fund	288	98	16
Oppose the fund	283	157	13
Operation of the scheme	225	24	9
Queries	83	76	5
Need more funding	9	12	3
Miscellaneous	37	15	4
<b>Base</b>	<b>849</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>41</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	22	42	33

### 6.14.1 Support the fund

Comments in support of the fund included:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Support the proposed funding / vehicle finance offer	262	89	11	102	258
Funding / support should be available to all those affected / fair to all	29	10	5	21	22
<b>Total</b>	<b>288</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>277</b>

Members of the public (n=262), businesses (n=89) especially those with vans (n=37) and taxis (n=39) and organisational representatives (n=11) who supported the finance offer felt removing the worst emitters and replacing them with zero or low-emission vehicles was priority, and it would only be fair to support those who are not able to afford the upgrade:

*“This is a good idea due to the price points associated with supposed clean air cars. There are still a high number of high emission vehicles on the roads because of the costs being so high for a low emission or zero emission car.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“This would massively help businesses like mine, who would struggle to replace an entire fleet” (Business, HGV)*

*“This sounds like a great offer. Makes an electric vehicle very realistic for our very small business” (Business, LGV)*

*“With Corona virus I am sure many taxis are struggling to survive. I think financial help would be a big bonus to keep them in business.” (Public, aged 55+, No Vehicle)*

Business respondents stated financial aid is required, as they would be unable to afford a new vehicle without aid. A few pointed to the current economic situation as putting additional strain on their business:

*“It would have to be generous as so many businesses are barely surviving in the current climate, any additional cost could be the end of their viability to continue operating.” (Business, LGV)*

*“This would massively help businesses like mine, who would struggle to replace an entire fleet” (Business, HGV)*

An elected official suggested that Greater Manchester Local Authorities could support through collective buying power:

*“Thought should be given to bringing together the buying power of all public bodies in Greater Manchester for a single fleet renewal strategy. There could be an advantage to securing more favourable lease or purchase contracts. This could be extended to allow Private Hire Drivers to benefit from any discounts realised through such a scheme, recognising their role as an essential part of our public transport system” (Councillor / Elected Official)*

## 6.14.2 Oppose the fund

The main reasons for opposing the funds included:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Oppose the vehicle finance offer / Concern not providing value for money	131	53	4	69	118
Vehicle finance offer will lead to more debt	40	63	1	70	34
Support should be given as a lump sum grant not a loan	46	32	4	41	41
Finance / loans provided should be affordable / low / zero interest	34	29	4	29	38
Support should not be available / not needed	48	1	0	7	42
<b>Base</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>256</b>

Several respondents from the public (n=131), businesses (n=53), and representatives (n=4) raised concerns about the vehicle financing offer:

**Concern about more debt:** Businesses (n=63), especially those with vans (n=16) and taxis (n=44) were unwilling to take on financial arrangements, which would put them into debt. Respondents felt the implementation of the CAP will have a negative impact on their current vehicle's value, increasing the amount of finance they would need to buy a compliant vehicle.

*"Many sole traders would be forced to use the vehicle finance offer as they do not have the funds to cover this massive cost, especially in current times - this finance would push many people in GM into debt which could lead to financial trouble." (Business, LGV)*

*"It's not financially viable to go into debt to continue to operate in the current climate with Covid-19 and the UK recession." (Business, Hackney)*

**The introduction of lump sum grants:** It was argued by businesses (n=32) they would rather have a grant than a loan in order to minimise the financial impact of upgrading vehicles. Linked to the point above respondents were concerned about the financial pressure a loan would bring:

*"Finance only works in cases where credit ratings and scores are good enough. Many small businesses have been through hardship and hence lack the score required" (Business, LGV)*

However, others argued the offer of lump sum grants could lead to mismanagement of public finance. Members of the public (n=46) and representatives (n=4) contended the offer of lump sum grants could lead to misuse or fraudulent activity, as well as leading to the subsidisation of businesses that aren't economically viable, and therefore argued for a loan option, or for no finance to be offered:

*"No lump sum should be given should be finance offer as some will take money and fold the company" (Public, aged 55+, HGV, Private Car)*

**A vehicle financing option with zero interest loans:** Some emphasised any loans would need to be zero or very low interest rates to make them a viable option for most, particularly taxi drivers (n=22).

**Funding should not be available:** Several members of the public (n=48) felt it was unnecessary to provide additional funding to road transport, either because the money should be spent elsewhere on other transport projects, such as on public transport and active travel modes, or in other areas of public sector spending:

*"Ridiculous - this money should be spent on public transport" (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*"We cannot afford this money - needs to be spent on social care, education and the NHS" (Public, No age provided, Private Car)*

### 6.14.3 Operation of the scheme

A wide variety of comments were received about the operation of the scheme including:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Concerns about the funding / support being mis-managed	71	6	1	7	71
Concerns / queries about where funding is coming	55	10	1	13	53
Concerns people claiming when not needed / abuse of the scheme	57	4	2	8	55
Funding should go to those who need it most / should be means tested	18	2	3	3	20
Support should be prioritised to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	12	1	0	0	13
Support should only be paid after vehicles have been invested in	6	2	0	0	8
Needs to be well-advertised	5	1	0	3	3
Support prioritised for older vehicles/most polluting	5	0	0	1	4
Support should be prioritised for voluntary / community / charities	3	0	1	2	2
Concerns may not be able to apply immediately / miss the opportunity	1	0	1	1	1
<b>Base</b>	<b>225</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>220</b>

**Misallocation of funds.** Several members of the public (n=71) were concerned the allocation of funding would be mismanaged by GMCA / TfGM / CAP scheme, with a few arguing the process should be operated entirely independently of the political system within GM and prioritising the environmental impact of investment rather than political or business:

*“Panel should be environmentally biased not business biased, and politically neutral.”  
(Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

Of particular concern to some respondents was the possibility of private companies being involved as part of the vehicle financing support and using this as an opportunity to profit from interest payments, leading to further financial difficulty for operators. Respondents with these concerns felt the fund should be managed by TfGM or GMCA and provide a competitive rate if a vehicle financing offer is utilised.

**Concerns about fraudulent claims of finance.** Respondents from the public (n=57) and representatives (n=2) were wary of abusive claims of the vehicle financing offer, indicating it was vitally important to implement means testing to ensure those who need the aid most received it, and to remove the possibility of fraudulent claims. Of concern was the prospect of larger firms having access to funding when it would not be required:



*“Lump sum grants should be ring-fenced; and / or payment made directly to vehicle dealers so as to prevent diversion of funds and fraud.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“This should only be awarded to small, individual operators or those providing a necessary social service. Large, commercial companies can pay out of their profits.” (Public, aged 55+, No Vehicle)*

**Concern about the level of financial support available:** There was some worry from participants of all groups there would be an insufficient level of funding from Local Government to provide the necessary aid to those who needed it, and more options should be provided by Central Government in the form of low-emission / zero-emission grants to encourage more operators to invest in cleaner vehicles:

*“This should be a Central Government scheme of discounts that are more generous than the £3K electric car grant that exists currently.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

**Compensation for already purchased vehicles:** Some businesses (n=7) outlined they had already purchased compliant vehicles, and therefore enquired whether there would be compensation:

*“What about the drivers who have already bought the vehicles they should be entitled to the grant as well it has to be fair for everyone?” (Public, aged 55+, No Vehicle)*

**Supportive of funding for electric and hybrid vehicles:** Several contributors from all groups mentioned funding should only be provided for upgrades to electric or hybrid vehicles, however, they did highlight that currently charging infrastructure is inadequate for the widespread usage of electric vehicles.

#### 6.14.4 Queries about the finance offer

Several queries were made:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Queries about the proposals - general comments	30	37	1	47	21
Queries about the proposals - vehicle finance offer / funding amount	33	22	2	30	27
Queries about the proposals - eligibility for the vehicle finance offer	17	22	3	26	15
Would like there to be more consultation with those affected	4	2	0	3	3
<b>Base</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>66</b>

**Uncertainty about eligibility for vehicle financing.** A couple of respondents from different groups gave comments, which showed they were uncertain about their eligibility for vehicle financing:

*“the eligibility is vague - grants some payable some not so, but obtaining a compliant vehicle is going to hit the small business hard when they have been affected by a downturn in business during CV19” (Public, 55+ Private Car)*

**Queries about the level of funding:** There were a number of queries about the level of funding being made available to fund the upgrade of vehicles, with many doubting whether there would be sufficient funding to provide for the number of public and businesses requiring


aid in GM (public, n=33; business, n=22; representatives, n=3). Participants, particularly taxis (n=11) were concerned the introduction of the CAP would skew vehicle prices within GM, making new vehicles unobtainable:

*“It would need to be enough to support my business and for dealerships to not put prices up before the funding comes in. As I would expect dealerships once they know the funding to add money on to van prices” (Business, LGV)*

### 6.14.5 Will the vehicle finance meet their needs?

In total, 37% of those who owned any of the potentially affected vehicles agreed the vehicle finance offer would meet their needs with 28% disagreeing. **Figure 6.3.** shows the level of agreement by vehicle type.

**Figure 6.3 Agreement the proposed vehicle finance offer would meet their needs by vehicles owned (%)**



Base: All eligible for the Clean Commercial Vehicle or Clean Taxi fund  
 Caution should be used where base is small (n<50)

37% of those who have been financially impacted by Covid-19, whether a business, taxi or organisation, agree the vehicle finance offer would help while 30% disagreed, of which 25% strongly disagree.

25% of those who have at least one impacted vehicle agree the vehicle finance offer will meet their needs and 29% disagree it will meet their needs.

The main reasons respondents agreed or disagreed the proposed finance offer would meet their needs is described below.

#### 6.14.5.1 Agree the fund meets their needs

**Support the proposed vehicle finance offer:** Some taxi drivers (n=4) and commercial operators (n=2) stated they supported the proposed funding, allowing them to upgrade to

newer, compliant vehicles. For most, it was necessary to have financial support to be able to do this:

*“For a company like ours that has no debt it would be the difference between survival or closure” (Business, Leisure HGV)*

*“It can help taxi drivers for low finance” (Business, PHV)*

*“Financial assistance to upgrade vehicles may allow us to carry on with our business” (Business, LGV, 10219)*

*“I would need financial support to upgrade my vehicle.” (Business, LGV)*

*“Will be massive support to upgrade for newer vehicle” (Business, PHV)*

#### 6.14.5.2 Disagree the fund meets their needs

**Oppose the proposed vehicle finance offer, financing should be given as a lump sum grant:** Some taxi drivers (n=8) and commercial operators (n=12) stated they opposed the proposed funding for a number of reasons. It was argued it would be insufficient finance to upgrade, and a grant option was preferred:

*“I would wish to negotiate a purchase in the knowledge that a lump sum was available. Not a fan of 'you must buy from XYZ. I assume any compliant vehicle could be bought and need not be new. Smaller 'one-man bands' such as I need to ensure VFM in van purchases.” (Business, LGV)*

*“Money needs to be provided to people who cannot afford to upgrade their vehicles and needs to be granted not financed. After the year we have just had and with no end in sight there is no money left to buy new vehicles” (Business, LGV)*

**Vehicle financing offer will lead to more debt:** The majority of taxi drivers (n=20) and some commercial operators (n=12) felt the vehicle financing offer would only lead to more debt, risking their or their businesses' financial state. A number of respondents referred to the current economic climate, which has put increased financial pressure on them:

*“I am already in debt because of this last year and I can't see business getting any better in next twelve months, plus it doesn't help when there are private hire vehicles from the Midlands and Liverpool working all over Greater Manchester” (Business, PHV)*

*“As need funds to upgrade for better car as with all this virus atm. I couldn't afford to keep my old car and it's getting hard with times like this to buy another car for taxis. As on top of the car got other expenses like taxi insurance and buy the time u get your taxi on road your need funds to do so” (Business, PHV)*

**Uncertainty about funding amount:** Commercial operators (n=4) and taxi drivers (n=2) were uncertain about the level of funding that would be available, and whether this would sufficiently aid them to upgrade their vehicles. Furthermore, some were concerned their low incomes and poor credit scores would affect their ability to receive finance:

*“Due to Covid-19 no extra funding is available, and loans are not forthcoming as not eligible due to low income through less work being undertaken” (Public, aged 55+, LGV, Private Car)*

*“Because at nearly 60 years of age & in rented accommodation I have a bad credit record” (Business, Hackney)*

*“unsure of how much the funding would be and whether I would be able to afford to upgrade my vehicle” (Business, LGV)*

*“I don't know how much I would receive so I don't know how much it would help. Where are the figures?” (Business, LGV)*

**Uncertainty around funding eligibility:** There was some uncertainty about how much support would be provided to commercial operators (n=3) and taxi drivers (n=4), depending on the size of their business:

*“We potentially have 14 vans and 1 minibus requiring an upgrade and 2 HGVs, although these could be under permanent local exemptions if road sweepers are considered specialist HGV. 3 vehicles are leased so specification could be upgraded at end of lease to ensure compliant vehicles in future, the rest are owned by the University. Support for max. 10 vehicles would cover two thirds of vehicle upgrades. However, we are not a small organisation so questionable whether we would receive any financial support.” (Organisation, The University of Manchester)*

*“Because I don’t know how much I would be eligible for yet!” (Business, LGV)*


## 6.15 Hardship fund and additional financial support

The proposed hardship fund and support was introduced to all respondents in the questionnaire as follows:

**Greater Manchester are proposing a Hardship Fund of at least £10m to support individuals, companies and organisations who are assessed to be most economically vulnerable to the Clean Air Zone daily charges. The scope and scale of support required will be considered in light of the impact of Covid-19 and the responses to this questionnaire.**

Businesses and representatives were more likely to support the hardship fund than members of the public, however, at least two-thirds of each type of respondent supported this fund.


**Figure 6.4 Respondents support of the hardship fund (%)**



Base: All respondents

Of the respondents who owned a vehicle, minibus owners and HGV owners had the highest proportion to support the hardship fund (89% and 84% respectively). **Figure 6.5** shows the level of support for all vehicle owners.

**Figure 6.5 Vehicle owners support of the hardship fund (%)**



Base: All respondents

Caution should be used where base is small (n<50)

### 6.15.1 Comments about the Hardship Fund

Respondents were asked whether they supported the introduction of a Hardship Fund, and their reasoning as to why they agreed or disagreed with the idea. Over a third of respondents gave a comment.

A third of the public and businesses provided a comment about the Hardship fund of which over two thirds were supportive, stating it was vital to help those who are likely to be most economically vulnerable to the CAP charges, and ensure social equality. A minority opposed its introduction, arguing the funding was not required, or were concerned the system would be abused.

**Table 6-6 Comments about the Hardship Fund**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Support the fund	844	206	41
Need more funding	53	30	4
Oppose the fund	148	21	3
Operation of the scheme	246	33	9
Operation of the scheme - prioritisation	115	17	6
Queries	15	7	1
Miscellaneous	33	10	3
<b>Base</b>	<b>1266</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>54</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	33	36	43

### 6.15.1.1 Support the fund

Comments in support of the fund included:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Support the proposed funding / needed for affected businesses	769	174	37	258	717
Funding is needed / important to ensure social equality	85	11	7	23	80
Funding needed for me / my business / to survive and continue operating	11	29	0	36	4
<b>Base</b>	<b>844</b>	<b>206</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>307</b>	<b>779</b>

There is a large amount of support for the introduction of a hardship fund from the public (n=769), business (n=174), and representatives (n=37). The main reasons given included.

**Important to protect vulnerable organisations:** Respondents across all groups are primarily concerned with protecting smaller businesses, charities and organisations that are an important part of the GM economy and have suffered considerably due to the Covid-19 pandemic. It is stated the fund is vitally important for ensuring a socially equitable transition to a cleaner city region:

*“This is incredibly necessary to help reduce some of the unequal economic impacts of the Covid-19 pandemic, and to make sure that the transition to a more sustainable city is a fair, inclusive and just transition.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Vehicle)*

*“Finding funds for an upgrade (to anything) can be difficult for many, impossible for some - so some financial capital support would help businesses who do not have the necessary cash to support development over and above average commercial maintenance.” (Organisation, Transport for Sick Children)*



*“We would agree that there are some groups will really struggle to get their vehicles to the right level to be compliant and should be supported as much as possible to get their vehicles to an appropriate standard.” (Organisation, Walk Ride Heaton)*

*“There are a lot of smaller organisations who would genuinely struggle to replace their older vehicles. For the sake of everyone’s health, it is vital that these vehicles are removed from the road ASAP.” (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*“Especially since the pandemic it is very important to support vulnerable businesses who will be hit hard by the zone.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

**Ensuring social equality:** Representatives (n=7) and members of the public (n=85) expressed the importance of minimising the impact of those who are most likely to be affected by the charges, ensuring businesses do not go bankrupt and are not put into debt:

*“We are concerned that with the current economic environment, the proposals will have a consequential negative impact upon our patients and visitors on lower incomes, some of our key worker staff and also some of our local suppliers and organisations we may be seeking to work with as part of our social value strategy.” (Organisation, The Northern Care Alliance NHS Group)*

*“We need to ensure that we are not increasing inequalities, therefore need to support those who most need support to maintain economic inclusion.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Whenever new regulations are introduced there are always people who fall below where the line is drawn and cannot afford to comply. To assist them to be compliant is the only fair way.” (Public, aged 55+, Leisure HGV, LGV)*

*“We live in a fundamentally unequal society where people are systematically disadvantaged. We should take every opportunity to support those in harder circumstances, otherwise these policies are likely to further impoverish and disadvantage those most in need.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

**Funding is required to help my business to survive:** Businesses (n=29) stressed the funding was vital to allow them personally or their business to survive and continue operating. A number refer to the impact of the current economic climate on their business:

*“My industry has been massively hit by the pandemic, many drivers have already called it a day, gone bump, are now living on benefits or have sought work elsewhere so a hardship fund for those that remain struggling through on around £3 an hour would be a massive help...” (Business, Hackney)*

*“We operate liveried vehicles; this is an extra cost that would have to be taken into account even if the grants / finance cover the cost of the vehicle. We have operated as a family firm in our area for over 100yrs our vehicles are a big part of our advertising/presence in the area.” (Business, Leisure HGV, LGV)*

*“because not all owners of HGV vehicles are large multinationals with unlimited resources, I will be financially hit hard by the CAZ zone.” (Business, HGV)*

*“As a business we are already feeling the pinch of CV19 and have had to apply for bounce back finance. Taking on more debt for a new vehicle is not something we would be happy doing so any help would be welcomed” (Business, LGV)*

*“The Hackney trade could be decimated by a combination of the CAZ and Covid-19.” (Business, Hackney)*

### 6.15.1.2 Need more funding

Several respondents felt more funding was required:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
A higher level of funding required for vehicles	53	30	4	36	51

Whilst the hardship fund is supported by the majority, there are concerns from several respondents of all types (public n=53; business n=30; representatives n=4) that there will not be an adequate level of funding available to support the transition to greener vehicles, given the level of increased hardship in the GM city region currently. Following the impact of Covid-19 and Brexit, contributors argue this has pushed more firms into financial difficulty, meaning more will need aid:

*“The fund needs to be bigger. There is already lots of hardship out there before Covid-19 hit, and then Brexit, and then you want to charge the poorest businesses to drive in GM. Many businesses will be up to their eyes in debt due to Covid-19 and will be unable to access any more cash from lenders. Taking on more debt could make some businesses unviable. you will need to have a decent scheme that will enable those firms to carry on trading. Businesses will be fighting to survive but this CAZ will be the final nail in the coffin for a great many.” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

*“Because £10m is not enough for Greater Manchester when you have over 14,000 private hire vehicles and 2,500 hackney carriage in Greater Manchester.” (Business, PHV Operator)*

### 6.15.1.3 Oppose the fund

The table below shows the most frequently given comments opposing the fund.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Funding should not be available / not needed	79	6	2	13	74
Oppose the hardship funding / it won't help those affected	49	10	1	15	43
Disagree with the fund because they disagree with the charges	15	4	0	4	15
Funding amount is too high / too much funding	6	1	0	2	5
<b>Base</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>136</b>

**Funding should not be made available.** Some members of the public (n=79) believe it is a waste of government funding to continue to support businesses that are unable to upgrade, either because the company is not financially viable, or because the firms should have considered the introduction of the CAP as part of their business planning:

*“I do not believe that taxi or other non-compliant vehicle operators should be handed public money to do what they should already be doing. Private businesses should meet their own business costs, unless they can demonstrate that there is some*

*public/community benefit to their area of business. Perhaps favourable loans could be made available to help upgrade their vehicles, but not hand-outs.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Cleaner air polices should be at the heart of organisations corporate responsibility therefore why hardship for them failing to adapt” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

**Unjust to support road transport:** Some opponents of the hardship fund, who are mainly from the public, felt it is unjust to support companies that have polluted and will continue to pollute in the GM city region for their own financial gain. It is argued by some that funding should be spent elsewhere to reduce emissions created by road transport, either by investing in public transport or active travel modes:

*“These people have been allowed to create serious pollution for many years at no cost to themselves. Working near one of the most polluted roads in Manchester has probably damaged my lungs. I don't see why they shouldn't take the consequences of what they have done.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

**Concerns about increases in taxation:** There were some concerns raised by members of the public that the money required for the hardship funding would lead to increased taxation by local government bodies. They pointed out that businesses and the public are already struggling in the current climate, and increases to Council Tax, for example, would have a negative financial impact on them:

*“I do not agree with the charges in the first place; if there were no charges there would be no need for a hardship fund. The hardship fund monies would come from the taxpayer, and so taxes would rise. This fund would be open to abuse and fraud and would cause an increase in bureaucracy.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

### 6.15.1.4 Operation of the scheme

The table below shows the most frequently given comments about the operation of the scheme.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Ensure funding is available to all those affected / fair to all	92	20	1	33	78
Concerns about people claiming for funding when not needed	73	6	3	7	75
Concerns about the funding being mis-managed	35	5	1	8	33
Concerns about where the funding is coming from	30	0	0	3	27
All those that operate GM and will be affected should be eligible	14	1	2	6	9
Needs to be well-advertised / promoted to ensure all those affected are aware and know how to apply for funding	9	1	1	2	9
Funding provided as a lump sum grant / not as a repayable loan	4	1	0	1	4
<b>Base</b>	<b>246</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>224</b>

**Concerns about people claiming for funding when not needed:** Members of the public (n=73) and representatives (n=3) are wary of people abusing the system, indicating it is vitally important to implement means testing to ensure those who need the aid most receive it, and to remove the possibility of fraudulent claims. Of concern was the prospect of larger firms having access to funding when it would not be required:

*“This change will undoubtedly affect taxi drivers and some precarious workers who would struggle to meet the ongoing cost and also struggle to upgrade a vehicle. I'm concerned that larger companies and organisations will have the infrastructure to mobilise and claim hardship, where perhaps none exists.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“It needs to be means tested. I do not think any company that is making profit should have access to funds when they absolutely have the means to pay themselves.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“Either a hardship fund for the most vulnerable, or a proper exemption system for these cases. Must be properly checked though to prevent fraudulent use”. (Organisation, Friends of the Trans Pennine Trail)*

**Correct allocation of funding:** Respondents from all groups (public n=35; business n=5; representatives n=1) also pointed to the importance of GMCA / TfGM / CAP allocating funding correctly, ensuring proper checks were made to ensure those who needed it most would receive it, and the system would therefore not be open to abusive claims:

*“Loss of livelihood would be a genuine hardship. Eligibility should be clear, strictly monitored but not requiring over-cumbersome procedures.” (Public, aged 55+, No Vehicle)*

*“Clear criteria must be established in order to access with proof required” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

### 6.15.1.5 Operation of the scheme – prioritisation

The table below shows the most frequently given comments about the operation of the scheme - prioritisation.

	General Public	Business	Represent - atives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Funds should be prioritised for sole traders/small businesses	62	9	4	16	58
Funding should go to those who need it most/should be means tested	33	5	1	7	31
Funds should be prioritised for voluntary / community / charities	21	1	2	5	19
Financial support for those who have recently upgraded their vehicle/s	1	2	0	0	3
Funding should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	2	0	1	0	3
Funding should only be paid after new vehicles have been invested in	2	0	0	0	2
<b>Base</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>109</b>

**Support for smaller businesses and sole traders:** Members of the public (n=62), businesses (n=9) and representatives (n=4) felt funding should be prioritised for smaller businesses, sole traders and charities to ensure they are able to become compliant. It was felt these firms have been badly affected by the current economic climate and will need an increased level of support to continue operating and invest in cleaner vehicles:

*“The smaller business sector has been hit heavily by the current pandemic and there may be little scope for financial investment and many self-employed/SMEs will be struggling to stand still for the next financial year so would be unable to make investment.” (Organisation, Communication Workers Union)*

*“Charities, scouts, churches, etc. would have fundraised hard to acquire such vehicles or had them donated. It may well be the case that they could not afford to upgrade their transport. Perhaps there could be a less stringent emissions level for such vehicles if there was no hardship fund.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

## 6.15.2 Additional support required by those impacted by the proposed clean air zone charges

Respondents were asked to detail any additional support they need if they are impacted by the proposed clean air zone charges. A third of businesses and a fifth of representatives provided a comment.

Most of the comments reiterated more support is needed.

**Table 6-7 Comments about additional support**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Support offered is sufficient	10	11	0
More support needed	210	186	16
General / Eligibility / Time	20	22	3
Management of funding	18	8	1
Electric vehicles / charging infrastructure	105	25	9
Miscellaneous	32	44	4
<b>Base</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>25</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	9	33	20

### 6.15.2.1 Support offered is sufficient

The table below shows comments about no additional support is required.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
No additional support needed / funding offered is good / fair / appropriate	10	11	0	21	0

**No additional support required:** Respondents (public n=10; business n=11) indicated they had no requirement for additional support, as the current proposals provide sufficient financial support to facilitate the transition, or they have been planning to upgrade vehicles as part of their business plan:

*“We’ve had it in our plans for a while and are going to slowly move vehicles onto electric as it’s the right thing to do.” (Public, aged 18-34, LGV, Private Car)*

*“No, we will comply at our cost, as we already have a Green Agenda. To provide a level playing field we would therefore expect any support for others to be carefully targeted and limited.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

### 6.15.2.2 More support needed

The table below shows comments about additional support is required.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
More financial support /funding needed to upgrade vehicle/s	83	115	8	164	28
Should be given 100% of total cost / given a compliant vehicle for free	40	34	1	69	6
Funding should go to those who need it most / should be means tested	37	15	5	18	36
More funding - sole traders / smaller companies/organisations	20	10	2	12	17
All those affected by the proposals should be eligible for funding	15	15	1	23	5
Financial support needed to be able to pay daily charges	16	11	0	20	7
Funding should available to all vehicle types / fair to all	5	2	0	5	2
More funding – voluntary / community / charities	4	0	2	5	1
Funding for other costs - insurance, maintenance, other fees etc	1	4	0	3	1
<b>Base</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>100</b>

**More financial support required.** A substantial number of respondents from the public (n=83) and businesses (n=115) indicated more financial support was needed across the board to allow for upgrading. Currently, in their view, the financial packages available would either mean costs are passed onto the consumer, or would lead to financial difficulty for the individual or business:

*“A reasonable package of support that would entice me to change to a compliant vehicle. The current level of support would mean I would run a non-compliant vehicle and pass the cost onto the customer in order to remain competitive.” (Business, LGV)*

*“Financial help to continue trading. Margins are already small, and the proposed costs would mean I would have to ‘shut up shop’ making myself and my 4 team members unemployed.” (Business, LGV)*

**Operators provided with 100% of the vehicle cost.** Some businesses (n=34) stated being given 100% of the vehicle cost was the only fair way to compensate operators for the introduction of the CAP.

*“Completely new vehicle.” (Business, Leisure Vehicle, Private Car)*

*“Fully funded car.” (Business, PHV)*

**Additional funding required for SMEs and Sole Traders:** Members of the public (n=20), businesses (n=10) and representatives (n=2) stated there should be more funding for sole traders and small businesses, given the small margins they operate on.



*“It would be useful to have some support for very small businesses who will suffer with increased transportation and supplier costs, and the reduction in customer volume.”*  
(Business, LGV)

**Financial support for the charges.** Members of the public (n=16) and businesses (n=11) indicated they would require financial support to pay for the charges, which they argue would be cheaper than upgrading newer vehicles:

*“Yes, as a small business employing 20 members of staff, this could be a disaster as we are Merseyside based and cover a lot of deliveries and collections in and out of the Great Manchester region. We would need cheaper daily rates to continue using our Euro 5 engine HGVs or grants to help purchase more Euro 6 trucks”* (Business, HGV)

### 6.15.2.3 General / Eligibility / Time

The table below shows comments about eligibility and timing.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
More time needed to adapt to the proposals	9	19	2	20	6
More time to allow electric vehicle technology available and cheaper	11	4	2	6	9
<b>Base</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>15</b>

**More time needed to adapt to the proposals.** Respondents (public n=9; business n=19; representatives n=2) indicated they would need more time to adapt to the current proposals, allowing for a more gradual replacement of vehicles within their fleets, and allowing some vehicles to reach the end of their natural life cycle which would reduce costs for businesses and reduce the amount of people requiring funding:

*“Phased introduction of zone would reduce the financial support required as fleets will usually replace older vehicles periodically due to natural life cycle of assets.”*  
(Business, LGV, HGV)

### Management of funding

The table below shows comments about management of funding.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Discounted charges for those who travel within the boundary frequently / those who pay in advance	6	6	0	10	2
Concerns where funding is coming from for this	7	1	1	1	7
Needs to be well-advertised	5	1	0	2	4
<b>Base</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>

**Discounted charges for those who travel within the boundary frequently.** Business respondents (n=6) argued for discounted charges for those who travel within the boundary frequently, but are not located within GM, or those who need to make one-off journeys:

*“A local business discount scheme & payment portal, which would allow for weekly or monthly payments by vehicle (to reduce admin requirements) & details of accredited, approved & extremely reputable vehicle emissions specialists who can retro fit modifications to assist with Euro 6 compliance.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

*“We could have a discounted rate if we are only serving the outskirts of the inclusion zone and not going into any built-up urban areas” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

#### 6.15.2.4 Electric vehicles / charging infrastructure

The table below shows comments about electric vehicles and charging infrastructure.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Availability of electric charging infrastructure	71	15	6	14	67
Should be more incentives to upgrade to electric / hybrid	29	3	1	4	28
Concerns about performance / availability of electric vehicles	12	9	3	7	13
<b>Base</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>99</b>

**More financial support for electric / hybrid vehicles:** Members of the public (n=29) would like to see more support for the transition to electric / hybrid vehicles, to ensure vehicles are being upgraded to zero / ultra-low carbon emission producers:

*“.... I would hope businesses as well as the public will be properly supported to go electric, for example, and that such vehicles would be exempt. With additional support and advice/ideas for businesses to rethink how they can conduct their businesses in more sustainable ways....” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

**Lack of electric vehicle infrastructure:** A large number of respondents (public n=71; business n=15; representatives n=6) who commented are very concerned about the currently available electric charging points in Greater Manchester.

*“Not really we’ve had it in our plans for a while and are going to slowly move vehicles onto electric as it’s the right thing to do. If money could go to charging infrastructure that would be nice particularly encouraging blocks of flats to put in chargers.” (Public, aged 18-34, LGV, Private Car)*

## 7. Impact of Covid-19

### Summary of findings:

- 76% of business and 79% of taxi owners, who responded to the survey, have been financially impacted by Covid-19.
- Over 80% of those financially impacted stated the financial impact included a lower turnover, making it the most common financial impact amongst respondents closely followed by lower profit.
- Businesses reported increased financial pressure, and many stated they could not afford to upgrade their vehicles at this time.
- Members of the public provided mixed views of Covid-19, some felt the goal to improve air quality should not be delayed by Covid-19 and the pandemic had highlighted the importance of air quality. Conversely, a similar number suggested that proposals should be reviewed due to the financial impact of Covid-19 on them and on businesses.

### 7.1 Introduction

Businesses, taxi drivers and operators and organisations were asked specific questions about the impact of Covid-19 on their business. All respondents were given the opportunity to provide comments about the impact of Covid-19 on their response to the proposals.

### 7.2 Level of impact

Figure 7.2 shows how respondents with different types of vehicle have been financially impacted by Covid-19. Overall, 76% of businesses and 79% of taxis owners and drivers that responded have been financially impacted.

Bus (95%) and coach (91%) operators have been the most impacted.

Figure 7.2 Financially impacted by Covid-19 (%)



Base: All businesses, taxis and organisations  
 Caution should be used where base is small (n<50)

Respondents were asked whether they had seen a financial impact due to Covid-19, using four criteria, level of debt, level of savings, turnover and profitability. The following definitions were used, for the purpose of this report, for a taxi driver, operator or business to be financially impacted by Covid-19.

Financial impact	Description
<b>Financially impacted by Covid-19</b>	A taxi driver, operator or business who has stated they have more debt or less savings or lower turnover or lower profitability as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic
<b>Not financially impacted by Covid-19</b>	A respondent who has stated they have either the same or less debt, the same or more savings, the same or higher turnover or the same or higher profitability as a result of Covid-19

Overall, 77% business, taxis drivers and operators and organisations have been financially impacted by Covid-19. The general public and representatives were not asked about the financial impact of Covid-19.

The table below shows the way each type of vehicle owner has been impacted by Covid-19. Of those financially impacted by Covid-19, 80% had received at least one type of financial support whether this was via the job retention scheme, a Government grant or loan, a business grant, self-employment income support or any other financial support. Of those who stated they had not been financially impacted by Covid-19, 44% had received at least one type of financial support.

The full breakdown of the financial impact of Covid-19 is shown in the data tables provided in **Appendix B**.

**Table 7-1 Financial impact of Covid-19**

Financial effect	Base (n)	Level of debt increased (%)	Reserves / Savings reduced (%)	Turnover lower (%)	Profitability lower (%)
Bus	19	62	79	90	95
Coach	23	35	63	100	90
Minibus	26	62	68	80	85
Van / LGV	303	65	74	86	82
HGV	108	69	80	90	90
Private hire	187	75	75	92	93
Hackney carriage	162	61	82	90	88
Private car (only)	23	50	64	83	73
Other vehicle	80	64	90	100	100
No vehicles	27	62	79	90	95

Base: all respondents financially impacted by Covid-19

Caution should be used where base is small (n<50)

### 7.3 Comments about the impact of Covid-19

In order to understand the impact of Covid-19 on businesses and organisations, these respondents were asked to detail how the pandemic would affect their ability to meet the clean air plan proposals. The general public were asked about the impact of Covid-19 on the proposals.

Half of businesses and representatives and a third of the public provided a comment. The table below shows the main comments made by each type of respondent:

**Table 7-2 Comments about the impact of Covid-19**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Impact of Covid-19 on business	486	369	40
Impact of Covid-19 on public	352	58	9
Timing / need for the proposals	385	47	20
Air quality	284	31	17
Funding	67	4	4
Miscellaneous	216	38	8
<b>Base</b>	<b>1266</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>65</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	33	52	52

### 7.3.1 Effect of Covid-19 on business

Respondents provided comments on Covid-19's effect on their business and how it impacts their efforts to comply with the proposals.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Increased financial pressures / income has fallen	281	279	27	308	272
Proposals are unfair as businesses are struggling due to Covid-19	228	104	13	134	209
Cannot afford to upgrade my vehicle/s due to Covid-19	43	95	7	102	35
Business may close / cease to operate due to Covid-19	24	40	3	40	26
Debt has increased / cannot afford more debt due to Covid-19	5	44	5	44	7
Brexit is causing issues / uncertainty about business performance	34	13	4	15	32
Savings / reserves have been used up/almost exhausted	8	30	7	33	8
No impact on my business/businesses / business has increased	4	30	2	16	18
Business is not eligible for financial support	3	21	3	20	5
Staff job losses / furloughed due to Covid-19	3	14	4	14	3
<b>Base</b>	<b>486</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>417</b>	<b>456</b>

**Increased financial pressure:** Over half of businesses (n=279), especially those with vans (n=127) and taxi drivers (n=130), stated they had increased financial pressures and / or income has fallen as a result of Covid-19:

*“Our business has been decimated by Covid. We have seen all our event work cancelled. Our CCTV video services have been impacted severely as it was rated to the pubs/clubs. We still have our domestic video services but it's tiny with few customers. The phones and emails are virtually dead. We had a strong small business with three different strings to our bow. Two of those areas have been killed by Covid. Entirely gone. Those two areas represented most of our turnover and paid the bills. The third area provided a bit of fill-in between other jobs. Even that is down massively. I'm seriously considering packing in and getting a job at Tesco” (Business, LGV)*

*“The Covid 19 pandemic meant that I was unable to work for a while, creating long term financial difficulty. Hence, it will be an issue to pay charges on a daily.” (Business, PHV)*

**Proposals are unfair on struggling businesses:** A quarter of comments received from businesses (n=104), especially those with vans (n=40) and taxi drivers (n=49), stated the proposals are unfair because businesses are already struggling due to Covid-19 and national restrictions made them reduce or stop trading:

*“However, as businesses still cope with the increasing economic impact from Covid19 and the looming threat posed by Brexit we believe that under the current format the proposals will add another layer of economic uncertainty and heap more financial pressure on many sections of the business community.” (Organisation, Chamber of Commerce)*

*“Sadly and totally due to the Covid-19 pandemic we have lost all of the other work we carried out on a daily and weekly basis, this includes Airport runs, days out, sporting activities and matches, festivals/concerts, race days stag/hen party's, weddings, birthday celebration, the list goes on, the impact of the Covid-19 virus pandemic has removed all of this work, making achieving the proposals impossible.” (Business, PHV)*

*“If the pandemic and conditions continue, to impose another charge on struggling businesses would be a death knell to many.” (Business, LGV)*

**Cannot afford to upgrade vehicle/s:** Around a quarter of businesses (n=95), in particular owners of vans (n=44) and taxi drivers (n=42), stated that due to the financial loss Covid-19 created for them, they are unable to upgrade their vehicles to comply with the proposals:

*“Its going to be struggle replacing vehicle. We were already struggling mainly due to out of town vehicle being allowed to work in Manchester with Covid will prove last nail in coffin” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Income generated is not enough to buy a new vehicle that will be compliant with clean air zone.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Capital replacement projects have been delayed as business priorities have been altered by the pandemic.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

**Increased debt:** Around a tenth of businesses (n=44) commented their debt has increased during the pandemic due to loss of regular income and they cannot afford to take on more debt to comply with the proposals:

*“It has destroyed me financially. left me with massive debts. I am in negative equity. No income to help pay my finance. Struggling on a daily basis going without any luxuries in life. living from hand to mouth. keep asking for payment breaks.” (Business, Hackney)*

*“Covid19 destroyed my income. I am living on universal credits which hardly covers my home rent and day to day expenses.” (Business, Hackney)*

**Business closures:** Businesses (n=40) stated they may close / cease to operate if the CAZ is introduced. This is due to the loss of work since the pandemic, keeping their business open and running may no longer be financially viable if the proposals are introduced:

*“If you introduce this then we are closing the business.” (Business, LGV)*

*“With Covid-19 i am already thinking of leaving the current job and go in to a different job.” (Business, Hackney)*

**Savings / reserves have been used up:** Businesses (n=30) stated in their comments they had to use their savings in order to survive the pandemic. Since there wasn't a steady income coming in, these savings have been almost exhausted:



*“Increase in outgoings as cost have remained the same. Less incomings. No support from government or LA. Savings being utilised to get through this period which would have helped under normal pre-pandemic circumstances in financing a newer compliant vehicle.” (Business, PHV)*

*“The pandemic has eaten away at any reserves I had that would have gone towards meeting the criteria outlined in the consultation document.” (Business, PHV)*

*“We no longer have savings available to put towards a clean air compliant vehicle.” (Business, LGV)*

In the focus groups, businesses highlighted how Covid-19 has impacted their business and they described how they are struggling to remain financially viable. The lack of trade in 2020 and the uncertainty for 2021 has made business unable to commit to any type of investment:

*“We are event florists, and we haven’t been doing any events this year. All events postponed or cancelled, and we have had to refund money, and it has been damaging to the business. You know, we are coming to the crunch point now, yeah, and as we move into January and February, which is a traditionally quiet time of year in our industry, that is where it is going to be really difficult.” (Focus Group: LGV)*

*“Covid-19 has affected all our businesses with the restrictions, and many businesses in our industry will not re-open, I don’t think. Reduced turnover, and the changes in the working world because of Covid-19 and businesses we supply to not operating etc. It is a real struggle and will be for a while yet. I’m not sure if we will survive it.” (Focus Group: LGV)*

Others worry the knock-on effects of Covid-19 will be felt in their financial credit ratings for any future borrowing they consider:

*“The thing to consider also is with the current Covid situation, everyone’s credit ratings will be getting downgraded anyway, because of, you know, there’s a lot of hesitancy out there for people to lend, isn’t there, at the moment. So, even if you know, twelve months, two years, you could have got the credit, maybe you might be downgraded 10% or something, you know, 50%, you don’t know until you need it. But a lot of companies won’t be in the same position now than they were twelve months ago.” (Focus Group: HGV)*

Although they changed their methods and adapted in order to still trade during the restrictions, these changes resulted in an increase in costs for the business:

*“And most of my vans are five-seaters, so before this, I was sending like five lads to a job in one van, but now I’m sending three vans to one job, with five men. Obviously, it’s costing more with everything, because I could send five men to one job in one van, but now I’ve got five men to a job in three vans. We basically would sign a contract to say one of my contracts has got three hundred hours on it, it might last six years, and when you sign it, it says duration of contract, so I can’t re-coup those costs.” (Focus Group: LGV)*

### 7.3.2 Effect of Covid-19 on individuals

Individuals also provided comments on Covid-19's effect on them.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Increased financial pressures / costs for me/individuals	261	55	9	121	201
No impact on me	80	0	0	17	63
Covid-19 has made it more difficult to use buses / public transport	9	2	0	3	7
Covid-19 is having a negative impact on lower income households	7	1	0	3	5
<b>Base</b>	<b>352</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>273</b>

Almost a quarter of the general public (n=261) stated they have had increased financial pressures / costs as a result of Covid-19 due to job losses and furlough. Those respondents who own an impacted vehicle such as leisure HGV or van (n=74) have also identified the proposal would add to these pressures.

*“People will still be getting over Covid restrictions having lost months of money. This is heartless. People are struggling having taken out loans, using life savings etc. This new charge is cruel to some of the lowest paid” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“During Covid I have worked all the way through as a front-line worker, if these costs came in to place my wages would be decreased massively due to my travel outgoings. Which would impact on my family life, home, costs.” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV, Private Car)*

*“Just as people are on the breadline, made redundant and can't get jobs you now want to charge people to drive.” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV, Private Car)*

*“Many of us are already just trying to survive as a result of the pandemic - these plans could make life even harder.” (Public, aged 18-34, LGV)*

### 7.3.3 Timing / need for the proposals

There were opposing views about the timings of the proposals:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Proposals should be delayed until after Covid-19	213	45	14	90	172
Covid-19 pandemic is temporary should not delay proposals	174	2	6	9	172
<b>Base</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>342</b>

**Shouldn't delay the proposals:** Members of the public (n=174), almost all who do not own an impacted vehicle, were more likely to state the pandemic is temporary and the proposals should not be delayed with many stating clean air should be priority and the proposals would also help to reduce the impact of Covid-19:

*"It's a difficult time for businesses to adapt to clean air rules but clean air/our health has to be prioritised. Won't clean air be more important if we have many people living with the long-term effects of Covid-19."* (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)

**Proposals should be delayed:** Conversely, members of the public (n=213), businesses (n=45) especially those with vans (n=13), representatives (n=14) and taxi drivers (n=22) commented that the proposals should be delayed until after the pandemic has passed. This would allow businesses to recover from the pandemic and be able to upgrade their vehicles:

*"The business did not operate for 2 months during the first lockdown. Our overheads such as rent and insurance did just continue to have to be paid. The business will simply not make any profit and probably a loss this financial year. To recover from this is going to take time. If we make profit, we have some money to invest in new vehicles or equipment. Without profit we just have to try to keep going without any additional expenditure."* (Business, LGV, HGV, Private Vehicle)

Focus group respondents reported they were so focused on trying to make it through Covid-19 and the short term, they could not begin to think about the long term. As one said, they may not have a business by then:

*"I think the big issue is the industry has got no money. We've all had nine months, pretty much twelve months without earning any money. Nobody's going to have the money to invest in vehicles next year. Nobody's investing this year, so everybody's a year behind where they were. There's not going to be the money next year, because we're not going to be as busy."* (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)

### 7.3.4 Impact of Covid-19 on perception of air quality

There were opposing views on the impact of Covid-19 on air quality from the public both in the questionnaire and in the Focus Groups in particular:

- Covid-19 has proved what air quality could be like and highlighted the need to continue with the proposals; **or**
- Covid-19 has already improved air quality and alongside the expectation more people will work from home, it means the proposals should be reviewed.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Covid-19 has highlighted the need to improve air quality	138	2	9	6	132
Proposals should be reviewed due to the improvement in air quality as a result of the Covid-19 lockdown	123	28	9	57	95
Work from home will reduce air pollution as a result of Covid-19	33	2	3	13	24
<b>Base</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>246</b>

**Highlighted the need to improve air quality** (public n=138; representatives n=9): Members of the public without an impacted vehicle (n=128) stated experiencing better air quality during lockdown had enabled them to see/feel the difference in air quality. It also highlighted air quality does impact health conditions:

*“I did see a lot of things about the fact that, you know, people weren’t really doing very much, and they weren’t going out and, obviously, because of that, that meant that like ... I think I saw like a picture of Venice, that the water was clear for the first time ever or something.” (Focus Group: Public, aged 18-34)*

*“Well, I mean I go back to the first lockdown as well, I had the good opportunity of going to a top floor, high hotel in Manchester and I could see the difference between the quality of the air, if you know what I mean, you can’t, you can sometimes see a haze over the city, whether that was in the morning or at night, you could certainly see it and during the lockdown even after ten days of the first lockdown I could certainly see a difference in the air quality.” (Focus Group: Public, Aged 40+)*

*“Covid-19 presents another health condition that is exacerbated by air quality issues and increases the need for the clean air zone proposals. However, it also increases financial stresses on individuals and businesses I would conclude that the clean air zone proposals remain, as a whole, well balanced” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

**Air Quality had improved due to reduced traffic and therefore the need for the proposals should be reviewed** (public n=123; business n=28; representatives n=9)

*“I’ve been working at home since March and I think it’s going to continue for some time really, and I think it’s changed, you know, certainly my like office environment. I think everybody’s thinking it’s never going to back, because I only worked three days anyway, you know, but I don’t think I’ll be going back to working three days in the office at all, really. Perhaps I might be just doing one day, one day a week or something in the office, but the rest of the time, I think it’s going to continue to be at home for the foreseeable future.” (Focus Group: Public aged 40+)*

*“Yes surely the whole zone and the data that formed its thinking should be checked to see if still valid especially in the city centre. How many people will actually come back into work here? (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

Mainly businesses with vans (n=14) and taxi drivers (n=13) felt not only had air quality improved because of lockdown it would not return to previous levels as peoples’ travel behaviour had been permanently changed and it was expected more people would continue to work from home after the pandemic.

*“Clean air zone too large. Target hotspots and charge a fuel levy to bring in funds to improve transport options. The new business landscape post Covid will be very different. Home working will reduce many journeys. Natural wastage will see less and less older vehicles on the road anyway. A petrol/diesel levy would encourage EV ownership too.” (Business, LGV)*

## 8. Overall impact of the Clean Air Plan

### Summary of findings:

- 74% of the public and 80% of representatives agree that air quality needs improving in Greater Manchester, while only 45% of businesses agree with this.
- 35% of the public and 40% of representatives are confident that the Clean Air Plan will bring down NO<sub>2</sub> levels. Just 23% of businesses feel the same way.
- Of those that provided a comment, around one third of the public, a quarter of representatives and a tenth of businesses commented that the proposals should go further and include private vehicles.
- Concerns were raised that prices will increase as a result of the proposal and there will be a negative impact on businesses.
- A quarter of businesses who commented felt the proposals will negatively impact them and some described the proposals as another form of tax and / or congestion charge.
- Almost a third of the public who provided a comment felt improving public transport and options for active travel would help improve air quality.

### 8.1 Introduction

This chapter provides the feedback from all respondents about the impact the introduction of the Clean Air Plan will have on them and their confidence in the Clean Air Plan to bring down roadside nitrogen dioxide to meet legal levels in the shortest possible time.

## 8.2 Air quality

All respondents were asked:

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that air quality needs to be improved in Greater Manchester?**

**Figure 8.1** shows more of the public and representatives strongly agree that air quality needs improving in Greater Manchester compared to businesses.

**Figure 8.1 Agreement air quality needs improving in Greater Manchester (%)**



Base: All respondents


### Summary of findings: General public and representatives

- 74% of the general public and 80% of representatives agreed air quality needs improving;
- Those aged under 35 are more likely to strongly agree air quality needs to be improved compared to other ages (67% compared to 57% aged 35-54 and 59% aged over 55);
- Significantly more respondents who live in Manchester (87%) either agree or strongly agree air quality needs improving than those living in other areas. Wigan (57%) and Bolton (59%), Rochdale (66%) and Tameside (68%) had the lowest levels of those who strongly agree or agree air quality needs improving in Greater Manchester; and
- Most (91%) of those who said they were vulnerable to air pollution for health reasons agreed it needs improving.

**Other findings:**

- 45% of businesses felt air quality needed to be improved; and
- Almost all (89%) of respondents who do not own a vehicle stated they agree or strongly agree air quality needs improving, compared to
  - Van / LGV owners (52%);
  - HGV leisure vehicle owners (49%)
  - HGV owners (45%);
  - Private hire vehicle drivers (45%); and
  - Hackney carriage drivers (26%).

**Figure 8.2 Agreement air quality needs improving by Local Authority (%)**




Base: All members of the public

The proportions of the public strongly agreeing air quality needs to be improved increases with greater health impacts of air pollution, as shown in **Figure 8.3**.



**Figure 8.3 Agreement air quality needs improving, and the affect air pollution has on the respondent's health (%)**



Base: All members of the public


### 8.3 Confidence in the Clean Air Plan

All respondents were asked:

**How confident are you that the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan would bring roadside nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) levels within legal limits in the shortest possible time?**

**Figure 8.4** shows the response to this question for each type of respondent. There are more members of the public unconfident than confident the CAP will bring down the levels of NO<sub>2</sub> in the shortest possible time (35% confident and 41% unconfident). The confidence of all other respondents is similar to the general public, with businesses having the highest proportion of respondents who are unconfident (48%).

**Figure 8.4 Confidence the CAP will bring down NO<sub>2</sub> levels (%)**



Base: All respondents

**Difference of option by respondent type**

Respondents who are described as confident or not confident below is based on the total for those who stated either fairly or very for their level of confidence.

- Of the public, those aged under 35 (43%) and aged 35-54 (43%) were not confident compared to those aged over 55 (34%). 40% of men were not confident compared to 34% of women;
- The public who live in Manchester, Stockport and Trafford were more likely to be confident, (41%, 38% and 40% respectively) about the Clean Air Plan, than those in Bolton (25%) and Wigan (24%);
- Those whose day-to-day activities are limited had the same level of confidence as those who have no limitations (both 37% confident, with 40% of those with limitations unconfident and 38% of those who do not have limitations unconfident);
- 40% of businesses with over 50 employees (medium and large) were confident about the Clean Air Plan compared to 14% of sole traders and 17% of micro businesses. Around half of sole traders and micro businesses were unconfident in the Clean Air Plan (52% and 48% respectively);
- Those who own an impacted vehicle were not confident in the Clean Air Plan compared to those who do not (48% and 38% respectively). Those who do not own an impacted vehicle are evenly split with both 38% confident and unconfident; and
- Respondents who do not own a vehicle were more likely to be confident in the Clean Air Plan (45%) than those who own an HGV leisure vehicle (11%), a van/LGV (17%), a taxi (23%) or an HGV (27%).

**Table 8-1** shows how much confidence respondents have in the Clean Air Plan to bring down NO<sub>2</sub> in the shortest time based on whether they agree air quality needs to be improved.

**Table 8-1 Confidence in CAP and agreement air quality needs to be improved (%)**

		Air quality needs to be improved in Greater Manchester %				
		Strongly agree	Slightly agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Slightly disagree	Strongly disagree
<b>Confidence in Clean Air Plan to bring down NO<sub>2</sub> in shortest time %</b>	Very confident	5	0	0	0	0
	Fairly confident	25	4	1	0	0
	Neither confident nor unconfident	7	4	4	1	1
	Fairly unconfident	11	4	3	1	1
	Very unconfident	7	3	5	2	9

Base: All respondents, excluding those who said don't know. (n=3449)

- 34% of all respondents agree air quality needs improvement and are confident the CAP will bring down NO<sub>2</sub> in the shortest time;
- 36% of all respondents agree air quality needs improvement and are neither confident / unconfident or are unconfident the CAP will bring down NO<sub>2</sub> in the shortest time; and
- 27% of all respondents did not agree (including neither agree nor disagree) that air quality needs improvement and equally are not confident the CAP will bring down NO<sub>2</sub> in the shortest time.

The next section summarises comments from respondents which indicates why they do or do not have confidence in the CAP to bring down NO<sub>2</sub> in the shortest time. The comments provided include:

1. Reasons the CAP is supported;
2. Reasons the CAP is not supported; and
3. Suggested amendments for the CAP to go further.

These suggested amendments may be considered as reasons why people feel air quality needs to be improved but they are not confident the CAP will bring down NO<sub>2</sub> in the shortest time.

## 8.4 Additional comments on the proposals

Respondents were asked to provide any additional comments on the proposals. Throughout the questionnaire respondents frequently gave additional comments. These have been collated and presented here.

Almost three quarters of the general public and representatives gave an additional comment as did 60% of businesses.

The general public and representatives tended to give supportive comments and suggested amendments or other measures to assist with improving air quality whereas businesses mainly raised concerns with the proposals.

**Table 8-2 Additional comments on the proposals**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Supporting the proposals*	1369	94	48
Opposing the proposals	1063	363	30
Suggested Amendments	1647	171	47
Sustainable Travel	834	52	27
Miscellaneous	501	67	28
<b>Base</b>	<b>2778</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>87</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	72	60	70

The consultation identified two email campaigns (**see section 2.2.2** for details).

\* comments received from both campaigns; Environmental Bill Lobby (n=172) and CAZ support group (n=484); 656 in total.

### 8.4.1 Supporting the proposals

Comments supporting the proposals included:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Support the proposals	976*	40	33	50	318
Proposals should go further	894*	25	18	24	253
Implement the proposals sooner / as soon as possible	797*	8	5	11	147
Older / most polluting vehicles should be targeted / replaced	112	25	1	30	108
All taxis should be cleaner / greener (e.g. electric, hybrid, hydrogen)	42	4	0	7	39
Air quality is still an issue in respect of other pollutants	40	6	3	12	36
<b>Base</b>	<b>1369</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>701</b>

The consultation identified two email campaigns (**see section 2.2.2** for details).

\* comments received from both campaigns; Environmental Bill Lobby (n=172) and CAZ support group (n=484); 656 in total.

**Support:** Over a third of members of the public and representatives commented they were in support of the proposals generally, with many stating ‘air quality is important’ especially with Covid-19 and other respiratory illnesses. Almost a tenth of businesses and taxi drivers gave supportive comments about the proposals (public n=976; business n=40; representatives n=33):

*“Great that GM is attempting something so ambitious for the good of local health and wellbeing, and the environment.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“I believe this is an excellent idea, especially by it reducing NO<sup>2</sup>.” (Public, aged under 18, No Vehicle)*

*“As someone who mostly walks/cycles I absolutely welcome the initiative. I also support the mitigating measures for support of transport businesses. I also feel that the charges for polluting commercial vehicles are only one of various ways to tackle the pollution problem. Radical and strictly enforced speed limits across GM combined with an extension of bus/taxi lanes and bike lanes would reduce pollution and also make walking and cycling safer, and discourage the use of private vehicles.” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

*“We all need to be proactive in helping with Pollution and peoples health.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

*“its going to happen. it will be painful but 5 years on it will be better for the area” (Public, aged 55+, Leisure HGV, Private Car)*

*“I think its very well thought through and you have plans to deal with sharing out the money fairly” (Business, LGV)*

However, a third of the public, a fifth of representatives and almost a tenth of businesses who provided a comment, suggested whilst the proposals are good, **they should go further**; for example, include private vehicles which are still polluting the air and causing congestion. (public n=894; business n=25; representatives n=18):

*“I don't think it will be taken seriously. I think the action needs to be more urgent with a nearer deadline.” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

*“Seems to be 'a drop in the ocean'” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“I don't believe they go far enough” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“Not big enough modal shift” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“I'm not sure there is enough to actually reduce the number of cars. It's not just about air pollution, traffic increases noise pollution and reduces general quality of life. In Manchester city in particular there needs to be a curb on the number of private vehicles. This is less of a problem in the surrounding areas of Greater Manchester. It doesn't seem logical to apply the same rules in Manchester and much less busy areas of GM.” (Public, aged 18-34, PHV)*

*“Yes, as I mention earlier everyone should drive electric car that's how we can achieve our clean air goal.” (Business, PHV)*

Friends of the Earth stated:

*“Whilst we welcome the plans for a CAZ in Greater Manchester, we do not accept that the current plans will bring air pollution within legal limits rapidly enough. They therefore not only breach national guidelines, but also subject the population to severe health implications for longer than necessary. We urge you to go further and to implement a CAZ D, i.e. one that includes restrictions on private cars.” (Organisation, Friends of the Earth)*

**Implement the proposals as soon as possible** (public n=797; business n=8; representatives n=5): Respondents in their comments stated the implementation of the proposals should be as soon as possible as pollution needs to be reduced to improve public health:

*“The timeline for this seems broad given how regularly the UK has missed emissions targets in the past. Change is never easy, but the evidence of the long term damage done to people's health by this sort of pollution necessitates that we act quickly.” (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*“It does really need to be classed as very important and implemented as soon as possible for the sake of people's health and the health of the planet.” (Public, aged 55+, No Owned Vehicle)*

*“Needs to be implemented more quickly. We already have significant health problems and disease caused by dirty air.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Under these plans, the CAZ won't be up and running until Spring 2022, polluting vans and coaches would remain exempt until 2023 and compliance with legal limits of pollution is not expected until 2024. This is unacceptable, every day that passes is a missed opportunity to protect people's health.” (Organisation, Asthma UK and British Lung Foundation)*

**Air quality is still an issue in respect of other pollutants** (public n=40; business n=6; representatives n=3): Respondents commented the Clean Air Plan alone won't clean the air, as there are other important pollutants that affect air quality:

*“Allow regional airports to take aircraft away from Manchester, this would reduce air pollution and decrease the amount of vehicle usage around this pollution hub.” (Business LGV)*

*“Stop people using these wood burning stoves would be a good idea.” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV)*

## 8.4.2 Opposing the proposals

Comments opposing the proposals included:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Oppose the proposals	651	223	14	360	515
Proposals are a stealth tax / congestion charge / money-making scheme	607	178	12	279	510
Concern about privately owned vehicles being included in the near future	157	8	4	29	138
There are more important areas to be spending the money on	133	16	1	31	117
Delay the proposals / implement at a later date	118	68	12	83	109
Air quality / pollution is not an issue in GM / proposals not needed	87	58	4	73	76
Should be a vote on the proposals	39	10	0	17	31
Should accept lower standards for vehicles to be compliant	16	23	1	28	11
<b>Base</b>	<b>1063</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>565</b>	<b>866</b>

Almost half of businesses (n=223) and a quarter of the public (n=651) who provided a comment stated they **oppose the proposals**, with many stating the proposals should be 'scrapped' and 'do not agree with charges'. Businesses with vans (n=102) and taxis (n=95) were more likely to oppose the proposals:

*"These proposals will kill the trade. Drivers cannot afford the cost of implementing these changes. There are plenty of proposals for safeguarding the members of the public but nothing for safety of the drivers." (Business, PHV)*

*"I don't think it is needed, over a few years the majority of vehicles will naturally meet euro 6 emissions anyway." (Business, LGV)*

*"There are many aspects of the strategy that are flawed. Charging the people who are the least likely to be able to afford newer cars is inherently wrong. You have to accept that a high percentage of the population that drive older cars do so because they cannot afford newer cars which are more expensive. Also the assumption that you can price someone into compliance is also not correct." (Business, Private Car)*

Members of the public who oppose the proposals did not feel the proposed approach will do enough to improve air quality:

*"If you would like to lower emissions and keep improved air quality in Greater Manchester, scrap these proposals and focus more on enabling more people to work from home. As we have seen during lockdown this has not only improved air quality but also improved peoples quality of life. By no longer having to engage in timely commutes, be it by private vehicle, train or bus, less emissions are generated." (Public, aged 35-54, LGV, Private Car)*

*"This is the wrong solution. All stick and no carrot." (Public, No age provided, LGV)*

*"If you want clean air from using 'clean' vehicles, target the manufacturers to make them affordable instead of handsome profits. Stop targeting people who are just trying to make a living" (Public, aged 35-54, LGV, Private Car)*

*"Nothing, I would probably breathe in the same amount of polluted air as I do now. It definitely won't reach the high quality standards set by the WHO." (Public, aged 18-34 Private Car, 1588)*

In addition, over a third of businesses (n=178) who commented oppose the proposals with many calling it another form of tax, or a reintroduction of the congestion charge. These comments were mainly received from businesses with vans (n=87) and taxi drivers (n=66):

*"Do not proceed with charges. I'm of the opinion that this is just another way of generating revenue, another stealth tax. If any charges are implemented I will move my business to an area outside Greater Manchester and will no longer conduct any business within the Greater Manchester area." (Business, LGV)*

*"As far as I'm aware the air quality is already within legal limits it's a money making exercise that will make millions for the local councils and government, vehicles all come to an end of life new cars are being made and bought on a daily basis cleaner vehicles will replace the old ones without owners being forced in to replacing their vehicles." (Business, Hackney)*

*"It's just a con the air is cleaner now than it as ever been just trying to make the motorist pay all the money you are spending on this stupid idea should be spent on the badly maintained roads." (Business, Private Car)*

A large number of those without an affected vehicle (n=510) felt the funds to support the proposals will come from additional taxes on the general public:

*“The likelihood of achieving near net zero emissions within 5-7 years is fantasy. The simple cost and scale is too great to be done in such short time frame. The funding ultimately comes from additional taxes to general public, in most cases I believe people will simply pay the charge and continue to drive non emission compliant vehicles.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“As stated earlier the whole process is over the top and can only be termed another tax that will affect the whole population with increased costs. Companies etc affected by the tax will just pass on these increases to the public. The amount of roads affected in each borough compared to the total amount of roads is minute less than one percent. Rochdale for example just over 1 km exceeds the proposed limit out of a total road distance of 642,000 kms.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

The Federation of Small Businesses (FSB) felt the proposals will not achieve a reduction in non-compliant vehicles, instead it will only cause an economic downturn as the following extract of the response shows:

*“The ultimate ambition is to obviously reduce the numbers of non-compliant vehicles and ensure an improvement in overall air quality. This will not be achieved solely by the blunt instrument of a daily charge which many see effectively as a new business tax due to start in just over 12 month’s time. This would wash down supply chains, amid what is likely to be a protracted economic downturn, and seems illogical to many in the business community.” (Organisation, FSB)*

**Delay the proposals** (public n=117; business n=68; representatives n=12): respondents stated the implementation of the proposals should be delayed giving people time to upgrade vehicles:

*“I would comply if given more time or cars deemed safe were affordable. Why should I have to pay hundreds a month to replace a car that is working perfectly fine??? This is WRONG.” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV)*

*“It should be delayed until 2030 when the sale of petrol and diesel vehicles ceases.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“My opinion is that this won’t be born overnight these changes will take 5 years to implement and all should be given the time to adapt to the CAZ. Due to the current Covid-19 pandemic i wouldn’t like to see any vulnerable business, organisations suffer even more due to this being implemented.” (Business, HGV, LGV)*

*“FSB survey shows 52% of businesses believe the CAZ should be put back beyond 2022 to give those least able to afford to upgrade their fleets longer to comply.” (Organisation, FSB)*

*“The problem is you can’t just put things in with a year’s notice. We need a long period of notice, because it is a slow moving industry, really. I don’t mean like you should say, right, you’ve got a year to do it, you know, you’d say it’s five years or in ten years, you’ve got to be at this point, because within that ten years or five years, operators would have updated the fleet anyway.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

**Concern about private vehicles included in the proposals:** Members of the public (n=157) expressed their concern about private vehicles also being charged in the future with many stating the current proposals are just a step away from congestion charges:

*“How does the council ensure they will not stop [next step] all cars from accessing the city centre? How do we ensure there will be no congestion charge like London?” (Public, aged 18-34, Other Vehicle)*



### 8.4.2.1 Suggested amendments

Respondents suggested a number of amendments and other initiatives that could be included in the proposals:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Should include private cars in the proposals	1003**	76	25	86	349
Other initiatives / measures to improve air quality	469*	37	11	75	255
Restrict / discourage vehicle use	271*	12	10	9	103
Cleaner vehicles / high standards to be compliant	292	21	10	17	126
Better road infrastructure / design / to reduce congestion/improve air quality	222	38	7	63	197
Reduce car use through vehicle sharing/ homeworking policy	222*	7	7	14	42
Pedestrianise / ban cars from the city centre	95	14	3	20	89
Vehicles should be charged / penalised for idling	68	7	5	12	62
Target / charge school runs	59	4	3	16	41
Should be a scrappage scheme for non-compliant vehicles	33	11	13	12	32
<b>Base</b>	<b>1647</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>247</b>	<b>917</b>

The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). Comments are marked in the table as follows:

\* comments received from the Environmental Bill Lobby email campaign (n=172)

\*\* comments received from both campaigns; Environmental Bill Lobby (n=172) and CAZ support group (n=484); 656 in total.

**Include private cars in the proposals** (public n=1003; business n=76; representatives n=25): Respondents felt private cars should be included in the proposals in order to improve air quality and also to reduce congestion on the roads:

*“The Clean Air Zone should also include private cars and motorbikes since they are the most numerous vehicles on the road, skirting around this issue won’t change anything at all.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*“I think because private vehicles aren’t banned and stuff like that or are not going to be charged, I don’t think there’ll be a positive. There’ll probably be a slight positive effect, but some people will have to give up their vehicles, because they can’t do that type of work anymore or whatever, it’ll have to change. I think there’ll be some effect, but I don’t think it’ll be the massive effect that they expect or they hope.” (Focus Group: Public, aged 18-40,)*

*"I believe that air quality is everyone's problem and, as such, cars should also be included in the plans to encourage the use of public transport. This is not just an issue caused by commercial vehicle operators." (Business, LGV, HGV)*

Representatives from several organisations felt the proposals did not go far enough:

*"We fear that not including private vehicles in the general reflection about clean air and healthier urban zones will lead to failure in meeting the legal requirements for Nitrate Dioxide emissions." (Organisation, Whalley Range Climate Action Group)*

*"There is a risk that excluding private vehicles from the proposals will lead to an increase in the usage of private vehicles, as opposed to taxis and buses, which may be perceived as more expensive following the introduction of the CAZ. An increase in private vehicle use - to the detriment of shared forms of travel - will have a negative impact on emissions and congestion in the region." (Business, Private Hire Operator)*

*"Whilst we welcome the plans for a CAZ in Greater Manchester, we do not accept that the current plans will bring air pollution within legal limits rapidly enough. They therefore not only breach national guidelines, but also subject the population to severe health implications for longer than necessary. We urge you to go further and to implement a CAZ D, i.e. one that includes restrictions on private cars." (Organisation, Friends of the Earth)*

**Need other initiatives** (public n=469; business n=37; representatives n=11): Respondents suggested other initiatives to improve air quality, such as stop building on greenbelt or building in general, which will generate more vehicle dependent households:

*"1000's of homes even on green belt or town centres going up all the time, cutting down trees won't help and neither will more people on the road... maybe you should target the developers more on all these new homes." (Business, LGV)*

*"Better to stop building new homes, and plant millions more trees." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*"Waste of space, destroying green belt area to build houses and increase traffic then charging for it." (Public, no age provided, Private Car)*

*"Stop building car parks labelled as 'park and ride' next to people's homes - mass concentration of dangerous atmospheric particulates in one area to save the same levels distributed across a wider area Greenwashing stop Building on greenbelt stop building more roads" (Public, no age provided, No Vehicle)*

*"plant more trees and make sure public transport tickets charges do not increase" (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

**Restrict and discourage vehicle usage** (public n=271; business n=12; representatives n=10): Restricting vehicle usage in general and banning cars in the city centre were popular responses suggesting those should be pedestrianised and improved with safe cycle lanes:

*"We need a huge expansion of measures that discourage car use, pedestrianize more space and massively expand cycling provision." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

**Need better road infrastructure** (public n=222; business n=38; representatives, n=7): Respondents commented on the layout of the current roads and suggest the infrastructure should be improved, which will help reduce congestion:

*"Improve roads and stop closing them when it is unnecessary. Give more funds to improve roads to reduce CO2 impact." (Business LGV)*

*“If traffic was allowed to flow more freely, journey times would be reduced and vehicles would spend less time on the road. Instead all ten local councils are more concerned about slowing traffic down and reducing the size of the roads causing longer journey times, vehicles on the road for much longer and pollution rising”. (Business, LGV)*

**Encourage vehicle sharing / promote homeworking** (public n=222; business n=7; representatives n=7): Respondents suggested by encouraging and promoting vehicle sharing not just the air quality will improve, but it will also help reducing congestion in GM:

*“I really think Greater Manchester should consider funding a scheme to enable 'shared cars'/car sharing' for groups of communities. Instead of a road/community of people each having their own car that they all use much less now due to many people working from home, set up a scheme so communities of people can subscribe to all sharing a single car that they can 'book' when they need it.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

**Vehicles should be charged / penalised for idling** (public n=68; business n=7; representatives n=5): Respondents identified idling engines at school drop-off and pick-ups and taxi's and PHVs waiting for their next passengers add unnecessarily to pollution:

*“Idling e.g. outside schools is a big contributor from private cars that also needs to be tackled.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“School Street plans are useful and need the commitment of local Councillors and officers who need to explain to parents that the spike in pollution is down to their car habits.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

**Scrappage scheme** (public n=33; business n=11; representatives n=13): Respondents suggested a scrappage scheme should be introduced for non-compliant vehicles:

*“I would rather support a programme similar to the scrappage scheme that would incentive organisations to switch over to cleaner vehicles sooner and just increasing road tax on dirty vehicles.” (Business, Private Car)*

*“It would be better if, as part of the financial assistance package, there is a requirement for the operator to scrap the older, more polluting vehicles rather than cascade them to other jurisdictions.” (Organisation, Cheshire East Council)*

**Need to invest revenue into GM's economy** (public n=63): Respondents felt revenue from the charges should be put back into the economy to improve Greater Manchester and the proposal should be promoted and communicated effectively:

*“I would like to see some of the funds used to support active travel, electric vehicles, and public transport.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“There should be a commitment to use the funds raised from the charges to directly benefit local environmental initiatives - greater investment in publicly owned transport etc.” (Public, aged 8-34, Private Car)*

### 8.4.3 Sustainable Transport

A number of suggestions were raised about active and sustainable travel:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Improve public transport	499	40	19	87	455
Promote / encourage more use of buses / public transport	273*	13	11	18	92
Promote / encourage more use of active travel	199*	3	9	2	25
Improve active travel options/infrastructure	137	7	10	15	129
Improve cycling options / infrastructure	122	5	0	11	113
<b>Base</b>	<b>834</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>604</b>

The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). \*comments received from the Environmental Bill Lobby email campaign (n=172)

Respondents provided the following comments in relation to active travel and public transport:

**Improve public transport and buses** (public n=499; businesses n=40; representatives n=19): Respondents stated buses and public transport in general needs to be improved and **should be promoted to encourage use** (public n=273; businesses n=13; representatives n=11) which will help reduce the number of private vehicles on the road and would improve air quality in GM especially in the city centre:

*“[We are] concerned about the unintended consequences of this being seen as a penalty on public transport, against our collective aims of creating an attractive, London-style, fully integrated transport system.” (Organisation, Liverpool City Regions Combined Authority)*

*“The Greater Manchester CAZ does not address or support the vital need for modal shift away from private cars. Firstly the scheme should at its core aim to maximise the mode share for bus, through policies that consistently and vigorously support conditions that allow bus operators to provide greater reliability, shorter journey times, and maintain and enhance network coverage and service frequency” (Business, Bus, Coach)*

*“Public transport needs vast improvement if that was world class you could take most of the cars off the road.” (Public, aged 18-35, Leisure LGV, HGV, Private Car)*

*“Increase public transport capacity so that people have alternative ways of travel once the CAZ comes into effect.” (Public, aged under 18, No Vehicle)*

*“Improved affordable public transport to reduce the number of cars driving into and around the city centre would be a better solution.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

Respondents in their comments stated an integrated transport system in GM is important. If it's cheap and easy to travel around GM it will encourage more people to move from their private vehicle to more sustainable ways of transport:

*“One way to reduce air pollution from commercial road vehicles servicing the public is to provide better connections between the arms of the hubs. Too often one has to take*

*a bus into a town centre and then another to reach a place that would be a far shorter journey by car. For example to get to Cheadle from Romiley it is necessary to get a bus into Stockport town centre and then another bus out to Cheadle so, if you have access to a car, the journey would be shorter and quicker though if many single drivers with no passengers were so doing (as they certainly are) the air pollution would certainly increase. All proposals need a realistic reappraisal of bus routes.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“I think they need to target the majority, I know I’m going back to what I said, but they need to target the majority, the majority are the people like us, who get the buses day to day. There’s far more of us than there is of these hackney cabs and vehicles and they need to put the funding into the public transport, reduce the cost to encourage more people to use it. I’m sure there are like Metro, like the distance that we travel the price per metre is more expensive than the tube and also our public transport in the UK is one of the most expensive in Europe. It’s just mad, it is crazy.” (Focus Group: Public, aged 18-40)*

*“Improving public transport is a big thing, you know, making sure that there’s more public transport, better quality public transport. You know and just more frequent services and you know, just making sure that the trains aren’t as crowded and that kind of thing and unreliable as they sometimes are.” (Focus Group: Public aged 40+)*

**Improve active travel options and infrastructure** (public n=137; business n=7; representatives n=10): Respondents stated active travel options and infrastructure in general needs to be improved and **should be promoted more to encourage use** (public n=199, representatives n=9). A safe and more attractive active travel infrastructure will help to reduce the number of private vehicles on the road especially in the city centre and will have better health benefits:

*“Alongside these proposals better safety and encouragement for cycling and walking is needed.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“My belief is that people should be encouraged to walk and cycle more, but the roads are dangerous and really only cater to motorists. With pedestrians being the least important of them all! All side roads should have a speed limit of 20mph (there really is no need to go any quicker) and this should be strictly enforced. We should look towards influence from places like the Netherlands and Belgium where bicycles are king and the roads and road users respect and work around them.” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV)*

*“More activity required around active travel and promotion of 15-minute neighbourhood. Need to change priority away from cars.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

Respondents stated that by improving public transport to make it affordable and reliable as well as active travel options this would encourage people to use sustainable travel modes and help reduce travel in private cars.

## 8.5 Impact of the proposals

Respondents were asked to detail any likely impact of the Clean Air Zone and support offered on them / their businesses / their organisations.

The table below shows the main comments made by each type of respondent. Over half of members of the public and three quarters of businesses commented on the potential impacts of the CAZ. Responses were polarised with members of the public giving positive and negative comments. Businesses highlighted mainly negative impacts.

**Table 8-3 Impact of the proposals**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Positive Impacts*	1014	76	28
Negative Impact to Greater Manchester	1089	281	50
Negative Impact to Business	475	483	44
Negative Impact to Public	474	142	14
Negative impact to the environment	592	82	20
Miscellaneous	71	33	4
Base	<b>2730</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>85</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	59	76	68

\*The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). These comments were provided in the Environmental Bill Lobby email campaign (n=172).

### 8.5.1 Positive Impacts

Positive comments were centred around the impact to air quality and were made by those that won't be personally negatively impacted i.e. they do not have a non-compliant vehicle.

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Support the proposals and efforts to improve air pollution	657*	22	18	29	494
No or small impact	397	51	11	29	428
Will need to replace vehicle/s and am prepared to do this	11	8	2	8	11
Will improve / encourage active travel / public transport use	7	0	0	0	7
Base	1014	76	28	64	878

\*The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). These comments were provided in the Environmental Bill Lobby email campaign (n=172).

**Will help to improve air quality** (public n=657; business n=22; representatives n=18): Respondents, especially members of the public without impacted vehicles (n=470), provided supportive comments on the proposals and its efforts to improve air quality and health:

*"I would be able to breathe better and hopefully avoid the long-term effects of air pollution in my health." (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

*"It could make walking along the road to and from local shops, waiting at the bus stop or walking for leisure smell less bad and be safer." (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*"I personally developed adult asthma so clean air will benefit me greatly as it will every other living organism on our planet." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*"Less air pollution for the families and children at our school. Reduction in lung conditions." (Organisation, Anonymous)*

*“We are anticipating the Clean Air Zone having a positive impact on our organisation and assist our work.” (Organisation, The Northern Care Alliance NHS Group)*

Some, particularly in the focus groups stated that although the proposal will impact them financially, they were happy to upgrade their vehicles for the greater good.

*“I have to agree, yeah, you are right, of course it’s our responsibility to be introduced, because it’s a good impact. It will bite us financially and impact on the businesses, but in the long run, you know, for the environment we should leave this planet safer for the new generation, so yes, this is our responsibility, you’re right.” (Focus Group: LGV)*

## 8.5.2 Negative Impact to Greater Manchester

Half of the comments from the public and businesses expressed concern about the impact to business across GM and the potential knock on effects on the public:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Concern about goods / services / fares increasing in price for people	741	92	27	164	671
Will negatively impact businesses / economy in Greater Manchester	529	189	31	335	390
Will cause me / my business to relocate to outside of Greater Manchester	62	25	1	50	36
Will increase my business prices to cover costs / charges	20	61	5	62	16
Will reduce travel to Greater Manchester / people will avoid the region	68	8	6	34	39
<b>Base</b>	<b>1089</b>	<b>281</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>484</b>	<b>894</b>

**Will increase cost of goods / fares / services** (public n=741; business n=92; representatives n=27): Responses to this question stated that they were concerned the charges would be passed on to the consumer through increased bus fares, delivery charges and taxi fares:

*“Higher charges for buses, taxis, goods in shops will all be passed on to the consumers.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“If I had to carry out my business when this tax is in place, I would pass the cost on to the already suffering businesses, in turn they would pass it on to the shoppers. This is the reason online shopping is growing so fast and towns and city centre businesses are going bankrupt.” (Business, Private Car)*

This was also raised in the focus groups:

*“People are going to have to pay more. I mean I couldn’t possibly run my company now buying all these vehicles at the same price as last year. Costs have got to go up because of these vehicles, so I am obviously going to be dearer than all the rest of the guys on here, that’s the way it is, so the costs have got to go up.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*



**Negative impact on GM based businesses** (public n=528; businesses n=189; representatives n=31): Respondents, especially businesses with vans (n=88) and taxis (n=72), felt the proposal would have a negative impact on Greater Manchester's economy as people and businesses will avoid the area and trade or shop elsewhere:

*"Traders will be discouraged from coming to GM and the economy will decline, resulting in financial problems for local authorities and a more depressed environment. Also, higher costs due to surcharges for deliveries." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*"This will hurt the local economy. So I expect to see prices for goods and services creeping up as the costs get passed on to consumers. Taxi fares will go up, businesses will incur extra costs transporting goods so prices will go up, local man-and-van trades will incur extra costs so their rates will have to go up. For an economy already on its knees from Covid, how can this be a sensible idea?" (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*"It would crucify business in the region. It is not an idea conceived in the round. The economic impacts would be equal or more than Covid." (Business, LGV)*

*"Could be detrimental to leisure organizations and could cause extra costs to members of social clubs. If they cannot afford the extra costs could also be detrimental to states of mind if people cannot afford to attend events" (Public, aged 35-54 Private Car)*

*"I can see many of the smaller businesses struggling with the extra costs. At a time when we should be helping small businesses this additional cost is the last thing they need." (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*"It will decimate the GM hackney trade. What will disable people do for transport then? What about elderly people?" (Business, Hackney)*

*"Any additional cost to a business will have an impact. We supply pubs and restaurants with drinks and enter Manchester City centre on a daily basis This will have a huge impact on the business overheads" (Business, LGV)*

**Reduce travel in to and around GM:** (public n=68; businesses n=8; representatives n=6): Respondents commented the proposal would reduce those travelling into Greater Manchester, which would have a negative effect on local businesses:

*"I would say that they need to look strongly at charging cars and not charging taxis. I would say that from my point of view it will be taking people away from Manchester, the Christmas markets and the school trips and the shopping trips will be going elsewhere, rather than paying this additional charge and not for one moment would it make me consider signing up to the finance on the Euro 6 coach, not for a moment." (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

*"Less travel into Manchester as all transport would increase fares to help pay charge. Less transport available as not all will afford the charge and give up. Less self-employed delivery drivers. The country is already going green. There is no need for this" (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*"Ah, from an equine industry point of view it's going to stop people coming in to Grater Manchester to use our equine facilities which is going to have a massive effect on that industry, you know, along with industries people investing. You know, we want people to invest in Greater Manchester." (Focus Group: Public HGV owners)*

**Will cause me / my business to relocate to outside of Greater Manchester** (public n=62; businesses n=25): Some suggested the proposals could lead them to relocate their business outside of Greater Manchester. The main reason appeared to be based on how the charges would increase their running costs:



*“Do not proceed with charges. I'm of the opinion that this is just another way of generating revenue, another stealth tax. If any charges are implemented, I will move my business to an area outside Greater Manchester and will no longer conduct any business within the Greater Manchester area.” (Business, LGV)*

### 8.5.3 Negative Impact to Business

Most of the comments from businesses expressed concern about the negative impacts the proposals will have on them including:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Will negatively impact my business / operations / performance	137	284	17	323	109
Cannot afford to upgrade my vehicle/s	190	203	14	287	115
Will cause business to close / lose my job	126	209	14	243	95
Will devalue my vehicle/s/will have to sell vehicle/s	61	33	4	78	16
Will have a negative impact on me / my business / organisation	35	52	3	55	33
Will need to replace vehicle/s	22	33	2	46	10
Concerned the price of compliant vehicles will increase	21	32	4	33	19
Will have a large / significant impact on me / my business / organisation	24	23	0	34	12
Unfair to those who bought a vehicle/s / not yet due for upgrade	10	24	4	23	14
Unfair to those located just outside of GM who don't qualify for funding	6	5	3	8	4
<b>Base</b>	<b>475</b>	<b>483</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>644</b>	<b>330</b>

**Negative impact on businesses in general** (public n=137; business n=284; representatives n=17): Respondents commented on how negatively the proposals will impact on their business operation. Taxis and businesses state Covid-19 has reduced trade and the additional charges will negatively affect businesses further:

*“I run a small company with around 15 regular drivers dealing entirely with airport and home to school transfers as our core business...The business is entirely dependent on two income streams, one of which (airport transfers) has since completely collapsed since the beginning of the Covid-19 crisis in March...The success of the business relies on the goodwill of our drivers and their ability to earn a decent income. Without them I might as well close now. If I can navigate through the Covid crisis successfully these next few months and encourage my team to see the advantages of applying to the*

*Clean Air Taxi Fund, I believe we will get through it. Failure in either of those aspects may well prove to be one step too far." (Business, PHV Operator)*

*"I feel that this will be an additional burden that we could well do without at the moment. We have been impacted by CV19 and have had to take on finance to help us out of this situation We don't need any more debt for a new vehicle as well" (Business LGV)*

*"Extra costs will be incurred due to delivery and collection companies from inside and outside the area increasing their costs, this will probably mean a loss of business as most of our competitors/customers are outside the GM border and we cannot increase charges just because of where we are based, which could lead to our eventual closure as we work on very tight margins." (Business, LGV)*

**Can't afford to upgrade vehicle** (public n=190; business n=203; representatives n=14): Many respondents, especially businesses with vans (n=86) and taxis (n=101), who answered the question felt they could not afford to upgrade their vehicle to be compliant:

*"The proposed support would not provide enough help to upgrade my vehicle which means added difficulties to already struggling trade." (Business PHV)*

*"The impact would be that I would not be able to afford to buy a brand-new vehicle on finance and I don't have the cash to buy one either." (Business LGV)*

In the Focus Groups respondents went into more detail about how difficult it would be for them to upgrade now:

*"I think the big issue is the industry has got no money. We've all had nine months, pretty much twelve months without earning any money. Nobody's going to have the money to invest in vehicles next year. Nobody's investing this year, so everybody's a year behind where they were. There's not going to be the money next year, because we're not going to be as busy." (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

*"The thing to consider also is with the current Covid situation, everyone's credit ratings will be getting downgraded anyway, because of, you know, there's a lot of hesitancy out there for people to lend, isn't there, at the moment. So, even if you know, twelve months, two years, you could have got the credit, maybe you might be downgraded 10% or something, you know, 50%, you don't know until you need it. But a lot of companies won't be in the same position now than they were twelve months ago." (Focus Group: HGV)*

*"We're the same, it'll put us out of business. Hundreds of children are going to be without transport and then your big boys like Stagecoach'll charge an absolute fortune because they'll be the only ones with the vehicles. Where does this money come from? You know what I mean." (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

**Business closures** (public n=126; business n=209; representatives n=14): Many respondents, especially businesses with vans (n=104) and taxis (n=79), expressed their concerns the proposed charges will cause their business to close since it will not be financially profitable to continue to operate:

*"This charge will undoubtedly force operators out of our industry and place a greater financial burden on the ones not eligible for funds to change. The potential knock on effect to our company and the industry in general is significant. This could be that we lose the ability to deliver the volumes required by our customers and so lose contracts and our business suffers. Or that we will be faced with becoming an operator ourselves and having to finance wagons, find drivers and a site where they can park and operate from. Or that we try to encourage the existing hauliers that work for us to renew their vehicles with our financial support. All of the above options present a huge financial commitment and a threat to our business. Our hauliers live outside the area and cannot*

*currently apply for funding. We cannot currently apply for funding as we do not operate any vehicles. The charge is too high at £60 per day for an HGV - this equates to £18,000 per vehicle per year, which businesses cannot absorb and is simply not recoverable from the customer/client receiving the goods. Our HGV operators rely on us for works, as we rely on them to deliver our products - if a proportion of them disappear as we currently anticipate, it will have a serious effect on our business and the industry in general.” (Business, Private Car)*

*“Covid-19 has affected all our businesses with the restrictions, and many businesses in our industry will not re-open, I don’t think. Reduced turnover, and the changes in the working world because of Covid-19 and businesses we supply to not operating etc. It is a real struggle and will be for a while yet. I’m not sure if we will survive it.” (Focus Group: LGV)*

*“Could be too expensive for us to continue as a small family business” (Business, Leisure LGV, HGV)*

*“As none of our specialist recovery vehicle are compliant, and we do not have the funds to replace them. We believe the business would close and jobs will be lost” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

*“I feel that my husband would be forced to retire even though he doesn’t want to, and can’t really afford to. The grant is not going to cover the cost of replacing the van we can’t do without, so we will be forced out of the market.” (Business, LGV)*

#### 8.5.4 Negative Impact to Public

Some concerns were raised about the potential negative impact to the public:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Will add costs / impact use of personal leisure vehicle/s / hobbies / clubs	306	7	10	274	32
Will impact me financially / add more costs to my life / activities	241	78	2	229	92
Will have a significant / detrimental impact on me financially	47	65	1	89	21
Will negatively impact mental health / wellbeing (e.g. stress)	52	10	7	47	17
<b>Base</b>	<b>474</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>465</b>	<b>144</b>

**Impact on personal leisure vehicle** (public n=306; business n=7; representatives n=10): Respondents who responded to the question stated the proposals would negatively impact the use of personal leisure vehicles. The most common type of leisure vehicle were horse boxes and motorhomes:

*“I have a motorhome that I use to holiday in the UK helping the local economy and I would be penalised for doing so. You are adversely affecting the tourist industry as well as the businesses of self-employed friends and acquaintances.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

*“Devastating. We do horse transport and also transport our own horses to various events. We will have to charge customers more when transporting to shows (which bolster the local economy) and then when we want to use the vehicle privately, we will also be charged.” (Business, LGV)*

**Additional cost to leisure / hobbies** (public n=241; business n=78; representatives n=2): Many equestrians and motorhome owners felt it would have a significant impact on their hobbies and could lead to issues with animal welfare:

*“I feel that I would be [un]fairly out of pocket and would suffer with not being able to get out and about on my horse. I would also feel more at danger from having to spend more time on the roads where people do not have respect for horse rider’s safety.” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV Leisure)*

**Severe financial impact** (public n=47; business n=65; representatives n=1): Many expressed their concern this would affect those already on low incomes or encourage people to drive in their own cars:

*“It could impact my ability to go to work or have a significant impact on my finances. I have to pay for taxis into work. If I have to pay extra for a clean air zone fee (because the taxi firms will pass on this charge) this will make the journey much more expensive. Rich able bodied people, with modern fancy cars, will ignore the zone and pay the charges because it won’t be much money for them. Poorer people with older cars, and disabled people relying on taxis, will be disproportionately affected, as usual.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“It costs money to run a diesel van. Insurance, tax, fuel, repairs. An electric van would have no fuel costs but would add to our electricity bill, a cost that is currently unknowable, and there are very few garages in our area currently that know how to repair electric vehicles, should something go wrong. Our Clean Air Zone charges could be an additional £1600/year (it currently costs us over £700 simply to insure our van)” (Business LGV)*

*“My vehicle is a mid-September 2015 registration but is Euro 5b not 6 as I thought. The daily CAZ charge would take a quarter if not more of my wage. I own a specially adapted WAV private hire minibuss and it would seriously impact my finances which have fallen drastically due to Covid-19” (Business, PHV)*

**Impact on mental health** (public n=52; business n=10; representatives n=7): respondents who answered the question identified a negative impact on their mental health. It is important to address the additional pressure Covid-19 has created:

*“Reduced state of mental health. Reduced leisure activities. Reduced family income husband is self-employed roofer. Reduced standard of living” (Public (55+) Leisure HG, LGV)*

*“There would be a significant impact on the shows and events I attend with my heritage vehicle, making my hobby unaffordable, reducing my social interaction, which in turn could have an adverse effect on my health and wellbeing. The area in which I live has a significant equestrian community that supports the local economy and these proposals could have an adverse effect. For the clean air initiative to be effective I feel you need to target the vehicles that are causing the problem - I believe this to be none compliant cars that undertake short journeys and carry no passengers.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

### 8.5.5 Negative impact to the environment

Concerns were raised about the potential negative impact the proposals will have on the environment:

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle
Won't improve air pollution / quality	514*	70	17	123	294
Will cause more congestion / encourage more private car use	93	13	3	23	82
Concerned about impact on bus / public transport routes / frequency	28	8	3	7	23
<b>Base</b>	<b>592</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>358</b>

\*The consultation identified two email campaigns (see section 2.2.2 for details). These comments were provided in the Environmental Bill Lobby email campaign (n=172).

**Won't improve air quality** (public n=514; business n=70; representatives n=17): Respondents expressed their concern the proposals would not improve air quality. Many stated the exclusion of private vehicle use to the proposals will create the same level of pollution. The aim should be to reduce the number of cars using the roads and improve public transport to provide people with an acceptable alternative:

*"The proposals will have little effect on congestion perhaps replacing one vehicle with a less polluting one. The demand is currently personal car use particularly in the face of Covid, the real benefits would come from reducing car use. For me it is impossible to say how long a journey on the roads will take and train services have been substandard." (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*"The impact on my health, as a resident of Manchester who lives off Wilmslow Road, would be unfortunately negligible given the refusal to include private cars. SUVs circle the local private schools, as wealthy parents pick up and drop off their children. This will continue, untouched, by the current plans." (Public, aged 18-34, No Vehicle)*

*"I have little confidence the proposals in their current form will have a positive effect. The scheme is unambitious, the charges are too low, money generated is being spent in the wrong places and the most polluting activity (people using their car to make short journeys when there are alternatives available - walking and cycling) are not being tackled." (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*"I work in the health sector. I am very keen to get air pollution down, and increase active travel. I am sorry, but I am not convinced that you will get the air pollution down without including private cars." (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

Both email campaigns commented that whilst the proposals are a good step towards reducing the impact of bad air quality, they do not go far enough and will not have a significant positive impact, particularly on vulnerable groups:

*"Targeted action to reduce pollution outside schools, hospitals, and care homes to protect those most at risk. Much more detail is needed on how those who are most at risk will be protected from all types of pollution." (Environmental Bill Lobby Campaign email)*

*“In 2018, the High Court ruled that air pollution in the UK be reduced to below legal limits within the shortest time possible. The proposed plan expects to reach legal compliance by 2024 - so a child born in 2018 will be seven before they can breathe ‘legally safe’ air. But legal air pollution limits are not the same as safe health limits and research has shown that air pollution - particularly ultrafine particulates - causes lifelong damage to children.” (CAZ support group)*

This was also raised in the Focus Groups:

*“In my opinion I don’t think it’ll change anything, as long as you’re allowing private cars in and stuff I don’t think it’ll change anything.” (Focus Group: Public, aged 18-40)*

*“I am a green operator which costs me a lot of money and a lot of work. This is just one thing that will encourage more people to use the car. So, if you’ve got a minibus carrying 15 children, that would be 15 more cars on the road because if that minibus isn’t there. So, what’s that doing to congestion.” (Focus Group: Minibus, Coach)*

**More private car use** (public n=93; business n=13; representatives n=3): Respondents suggested in their comments that these proposals will increase fares and services, which could increase private vehicle usage since that will be a better and cheaper alternative. They suggested this would lead to more congestions on the roads:

*“Less likely to travel by public transport as personal car use would become more financially affordable. Less likely to travel into the city.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

## 9. Equality Impact Assessment

### 9.1 The EQIA

Under equality legislation, there is a requirement to have due regard for the need to:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment and victimisation;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic, and persons who do not share it; and
- Foster good relations between those who have a relevant protected characteristic and those who don't.

Relevant protected characteristics are age; disability; gender reassignment; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex and sexual orientation.

The draft analysis of potential impacts of the Clean Air Plan proposals is set out in the document "Equality Impact Analysis" which is part of the suite of documents available to consultees.

Respondents were directed to review the assessment and asked if they had any comments. Very few comments were received as most respondents did not feel equipped to comment. The responses received to this question are described below in Overall Response.

The perceived impacts of the CAZ have been discussed in the previous chapter and these responses have been further analysed by protected characteristics including age, gender, ethnic origin and limiting long term illness in order to establish if any impacts were mentioned more by one group than another and these are described in Difference in Impact by Demographics

### 9.2 Overall Response

Very few respondents gave a comment about the Equality Impact Assessment; just 9% of the public and 8% of businesses. A fifth of representatives provided a comment.

**Table 9-1 Comments about the Equality Impact Assessment**

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Support	51	7	7
Oppose	82	16	2
Age and gender	46	9	3
Ethnicity	13	8	2
Health and disability	72	15	9
Financial	122	23	9
Miscellaneous	34	6	0
<b>Base</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>24</b>
Proportion of all respondents (%)	9	8	20

## 9.2.1 Summary of the EQIA

Relatively few comments were received about the EQIA and many comments highlighted that most providing a comment had not read the accompanying EQIA document and had a lack of understanding of its purpose:

*“Everybody should be treated equally, why do we have to highlight those that are different thereby making them stand out from the crowd and encouraging discrimination. Having said that you should ensure that the scheme meets the needs of all sections of society.” (Public, aged 55+, Private Car)*

However, those that did read the documentation gave positive comments:

*“The impact assessment thoroughly addresses equality issues and highlights groups who will particularly benefit from clean air. It provides further evidence of the importance of the clean air proposals being adopted.” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

*“It seems very thorough and accurate.” (Business, LGV)*

The main comments received included:

**Finance and Income:** although not to be considered a protected characteristic, finance and income were identified as being a key consideration to the proposal. Respondents (public n=120; business n=23; representatives n=8) felt the proposals would have a greater negative impact on those from poorer / lower income households:

*“Equality Impact Assessments should also consider socio economic inequality, i.e. the impact on people on low incomes. I know this is not a legal requirement as it's not a protected characteristic, but it should be, and GM could decide for itself to include such a consideration in future equality impact assessments, e.g. through the introduction of a "socio-economic duty".(Public, 35-54, No Vehicle)*

*“Careful not to price poorer people off the road, we need transport options too” (Public aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“Any economic equality impact should [be] addressed and at the same time will hopefully be more than balanced out by the health improvements as those in poverty are more likely to be exposed to low air quality and the associated health risks, and impacts on education and employment.” (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

*“working peoples incomes will suffer. costs of living for local services will rise. not a good idea.” (Organisation, Anonymous)*

*“The clean air proposals contribute to the division of rich business and those who are not doing as well or fresh startups meaning that it is in itself unequal and promotes inequality.” (Business, LGV)*

**Health and disability issues:** Almost a fifth of members of the public raised concerns for those with disabilities or long-term health issues, in particular those related to respiratory health concerns (public n=177):

*“In terms of disability, it is important that people who rely on cars are due disability are not penalised. Also, people with long term medical conditions are adversely affected by air pollution. I feel very stressed about the air quality due to the very significant reduction in life expectancy for me due to my heart transplant; life expectancy is reduced by 25% in very highly polluted areas...” (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

Friends of the Earth made several points about health and social impact, including:



*“Poorer households without cars are less likely to create air pollution but suffer disproportionately from the air pollution and poor quality environments created by other peoples’ vehicles.” (Organisation, Friends of the Earth)*

*“Some of the most vulnerable in our society are hit hardest by bad air – the elderly, the young and the most disadvantaged (who are more likely to live near main roads where pollution is worst). People in vehicles can be exposed to worse air than those walking or cycling the same route” (Organisation, Friends of the Earth)*

**Ethnic Origin** (public n=8, Taxi n=6): There was also concern that highlighted the proposal will have a negative impact on those from ethnic minority groups:

*“Lot of private hire drivers are from BAME backgrounds so any acts should not disproportionately affect this group.” (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

### 9.2.2 Difference in Impact by Demographics

There were very few differences in the comments received by members of the public. Small differences in responses given included:

- **Over 55s:** were more concerned the proposal will result in a rise in the cost of goods, services and fares (n=297);
- **Men:** were more concerned the proposal will result in a rise in the cost of goods, services and fares (n=349); and
- **Women:** were concerned about the increased cost to use their personal leisure vehicles (n=189).

## 10. Comments on the consultation

Throughout the questionnaire, respondents provided comments on the consultation process and materials, as well as making comparisons between the proposals and other cities and countries inside and outside of the UK. The below table shows that comments on the consultation were provided by just over half (51%) of all business respondents, almost a third (32%) of representatives, and just over a fifth (21%) of the general public.

### 10.1.1.1 Comments on the Consultation

	General Public	Business	Representatives
Comparison made to another city or country in the UK	169	75	17
Comparison made to another city or country in Europe	26	2	2
Comparison made to another city or country elsewhere	16	5	1
Criticism of TfGM or Council or Mayor or Government	508	133	19
Comments on the survey / consultation materials	200	64	13
Comments about Minimum Licensing Standards	44	15	4
<b>Base</b>	<b>797</b>	<b>224</b>	<b>39</b>

**Criticism of TfGM or Council or Mayor or Government** (public n=508; business n=133; representatives n=19): These comments constituted the majority of additional comments about the consultation, with 13% of the general public, 30% of business respondents, and 15% of representatives providing comments criticising TfGM, the Council, Mayor or wider government in relation to the CAP proposals. Many of the comments provided criticism while expressing how they felt the proposals were unfair, poorly timed, and they were designed to make money for councils and local government while causing unemployment and hardship for those affected:

*“It should not even be being considered. Yet another example of democracy being sidestepped and is obviously just a money-making exercise. Legislation is already in place to phase out petrol/diesel cars, but the Government/Councils cannot wait to get their hands-on easy money. Bear in mind every increase in business costs passed on to consumers equates to a rise in VAT revenue. This just amounts to another tax on motorists alongside road tax, fuel duty, insurance tax... It will adversely affect hundreds, if not thousands. of people/businesses. It will lead to price rises at a time when the population can least afford it due to Covid-19 and Brexit, and the subsequent rise in unemployment. If I remember rightly, this is being implemented in Manchester by a Mayor the electorate voted not to have.” (Public, aged 55+, LGV)*

*“GMC has created this problem deliberately. The plan is insane if you want businesses to survive. Do not forget, you only receive council tax etc. from businesses because they can operate within the area. If you squeeze them out, then your revenue will stop. You have already systematically narrowed, closed, and redesigned roads in and around Manchester to create and enhance the congestion and emission problem. Open up the roads to prevent all the standing traffic you have created. This would help both businesses and the environment more. If you do not, then we will definitely relocate our business outside the GMC area, and many jobs will be lost as a result. I/we believe that many other businesses will follow suit. This will mean that you will eventually create a comparative wasteland of a city, and your revenue will drop. Hence why this pan of yours is insane.” (Business, Private Car)*

Some respondents expressed their scepticism about the consultation process, feeling the views of those affected will not be taken into consideration and the proposals will not change as a result of this process. A number of respondents felt those affected were being unfairly targeted under “false green credentials”, and some felt the higher levels of congestion and air pollution were a direct result of poor planning and transport infrastructure changes:

*“You know very well that this is not a proposal. You are going to do this regardless of what anybody says. Greater Manchester Council have never made it a secret that they hate motorists despite the fact a city without car access dies fairly quickly. I think this is nothing more than a money-making scam where, once again, drivers are crucified under false green credentials.” (Business, Private Car)*

**Comments on the survey / consultation materials** (public n=200; business n=64; representatives n=13): Some respondents felt the survey and / or consultation document was too long and detailed, believing this would deter people from completing the survey. These respondents expressed concerns the responses to the survey may misrepresent the impact of the proposals:

*“The document is so long that it will discourage people from completing it which will give a false impression that people accept it. This can be measured by the number of incomplete submissions. Will you be declaring that number?” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV)*

Although some felt the consultation document was too detailed, others felt the consultation materials lacked evidence and data regarding the impact of vehicles on pollution levels, with some feeling the materials presented a “misleading” image of vehicle emissions:

*“It is difficult to comment on the effect on pollution levels and how the proposal may improve matters given that the consultation document contains little or no data on the subject.” (Public, aged 35-54, LGV, Private Car)*

*“We have to record our shock at seeing rather negative and misleading imagery used in the Consultation video, displaying cars as being apparently clean, but buses and coaches (as well as taxis and HGVs) shown as emitting smoke. We appreciate this is to amplify the point of vehicles included in the CAZ, but this is an untrue image and highly misleading and can cause negative reinforced perceptions from the public.” (Organisation, CPT)*

**Comparison made to another city or country in the UK** (public n=169; business n=75; representatives n=17): Most of these comments made comparisons between the CAP proposals in Greater Manchester and the Clean Air Zones proposed in Leeds and Birmingham or making comparisons to London’s existing Ultra Low Emissions Zone (ULEZ). Many who commented about other Clean Air Zones planned across England reflected on how some councils had decided to postpone or cancel their Clean Air Zones due to the impact of Covid-19. Respondents believed these decisions had been made due to the impact of Covid-19 on the economy and the feasibility for businesses to upgrade their non-compliant vehicles, as well as the impact of Covid-19 on traffic and pollution levels. These respondents questioned whether a Clean Air Zone was still required or whether roadside nitrogen dioxide levels were now within legal limits across Greater Manchester:

*“The pain this will cause to business and jobs is undeniable. As per the Leeds CAZ, which has now been cancelled with a waste of millions of pounds! Newer/cleaner vehicles are coming into service all the time, which will bring the clean air down to the required levels. The natural vehicle replacement cycle is the solution.” (Business, LGV, HGV)*

*“We believe that TfGM and all authorities within the region must continue to take into account the following: A number of other cities across England have since cancelled introducing a Clean Air Zone as the resulting drop in traffic and emissions has brought*

*the area to within legal limits. We would welcome clarification as to whether there has been any significant change in air quality levels within the Greater Manchester area and whether this model of CAZ is necessarily still required?" (Business, LGV, HGV)*

Some respondents made comparisons to London's ULEZ, sharing how they felt it had not helped to reduce congestion and emission levels there and feeling it would not make a difference in Greater Manchester either. Instead, these respondents felt other initiatives or aspects should be focused on to improve air quality and discourage private car use, and improving public transport and making it more reliable, affordable, and accessible:

*"London have the congestion charge, but it is still busy, still congested, still heavily polluted, so no, it will not help with clean air. Change the public transport making it reliable, affordable and easy to use." (Public, aged 35-54, No Vehicle)*

*"Penalising people hasn't worked in London so why would it work here? We need real initiatives not just ways of making money whilst not addressing the problem." (Public, aged 35-54, LGV)*

In contrast to those who made comparisons to London's ULEZ but felt it was ineffective in reducing traffic and air pollution levels, other respondents felt Greater Manchester's CAP proposals needed to go further to more closely resemble London's ULEZ. These respondents discussed how they felt the proposed charges, affected vehicle types, and restrictions needed to go further in order to successfully reduce air pollution in the region:

*"It seems like in London an Ultra Low Emissions Zone was needed to tackle air pollution, which is why I said I was unconfident that these proposals will deal with air pollution. I hope that there will be robust monitoring and that changes will go further if it is needed to address climate change and the current public health problems caused by air pollution and overuse of personal vehicles." (Public, aged 18-34, Private Car)*

*"The proposed levels for HGVs and coaches are significantly less than that charged in the London ULEZ. The proposed charging rate is not a motivator for owners to upgrade vehicles. As for Taxis/PHVs, the daily charge level is about the level of a single fare and is nowhere near enough to drive change in vehicles." (Public, aged 35-54, Private Car)*

## Appendix A Methodology

Appendix A details the full methodology for the consultation. The questionnaire was designed by TfGM on behalf of the 10 GM Local Authorities, with input and approval from the LAs. The following stages were then completed:

- Testing the questionnaire for clarity and understanding;
- Scripting the questionnaire;
- Data analysis; and
- Coding responses;

### Questionnaire Design

With any research, it is important to test and ensure the methodology and questionnaire are fit for purpose and ultimately provide the outputs required to fulfil the research objectives and questions. A large proportion of this questionnaire was cognitively tested and live tested during the Clean Air Plan “Conversation”, a public engagement exercise was undertaken prior to this consultation. Therefore, it was agreed AECOM would complete a minimum of 50 pilot interviews of the survey.

#### Pilot Testing

To ensure the survey was tested, the questionnaire was sent to a mix of respondents with 34 members of the public, 21 taxi / PHV companies / drivers and 131 businesses. Recruitment was undertaken by AECOM’s in-house recruitment team.

A unique web link was emailed to everyone who was recruited to ensure the questionnaire could only be completed once. 58 respondents completed the questionnaire.

The pilot was used to test the data we obtained from the responses and the length of the questionnaire. The survey took on average 25 minutes to complete with the shortest being 4 minutes and the longest being just over 60 minutes.

For the purpose of the pilot, at the end of the survey we provided an open comment box to receive feedback on the questionnaire. We reviewed these comments against the revised questionnaire to ensure any errors in format were corrected before the final questionnaire was approved for distribution for the live survey.

#### Scripting the questionnaire

The questionnaire was scripted using Askia survey software. The script was checked to ensure all text matched the paper questionnaire, routing was accurate, and the survey was user-friendly for anyone completing it.

### Data analysis

Data was imported from Askia into SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences).

All paper copies received were reviewed, quality checked before the responses were entered in the online questionnaire.

Data was cleaned by allocating additional codes to identify where respondents had been shown a question but chosen not to give a response and where respondents had been routed past a question, e.g. the general public were not asked about the effect of Covid-19 on their business. Additional variables were created using syntax in preparation for analysis, for example, those who were and were not financially impacted by Covid-19.

## Coding responses

For each open-ended question, a process of human coding was completed to develop a number of themes based on the responses provided for each question.

For each question, a code frame was developed to capture the key themes from an initial set of responses and TfGM reviewed each code frame. A team of trained coders worked to code each response in each question and where the potential for new codes emerged, these were added to the code frame in agreement with TfGM. All coding went through two sets of reviewing for full quality assurance by AECOM, before TfGM completed a final quality review.

## Late responses

Four online responses, two hard copies and eleven emails were received shortly after the deadline of 3 December 2020 at 23:59 and have not been included in the data. Responses included:

### Online:

- **Organisation:** felt cars should be included and thought boundary was too large;
- **Business:** small business, felt charges were high. Funding was low and concerned about welfare of small business vs large;
- **Public - for:** was mainly concerned private cars should not be included rather than commenting on the vehicle types included in the proposals;
- **Public – against** commented about the combined negative effect of the proposal and Covid-19.

### Emails:

- **Campaign emails:** Four from the Environmental Bill Lobby and three from the CAZ support group;
- **Organisation:** 1 from an organisation who had already submitted a response in the online questionnaire;
- **Business:** 1 from another business (John Lewis / Waitrose) they agree with the CAP, requests as much time as possible to prepare and proposes a lower daily charge for HGVs;
- **Public:** 1 member of the public who had already emailed as part of a campaign wanted to add some thoughts on the value of elective vehicles compared to petrol and ask people to drive less;
- **Public:** 1 from a horse rider who lives outside Greater Manchester, supports air quality but financial cost to them is high.

## Appendix B Data tables

### Are you responding to this consultation as a...?

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Member of the public</b>	3858	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Business (including self-employed and sole traders)</b>	0	0%	441	100%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Hackney / private hire vehicle - driver / operator</b>	0	0%	0	0%	343	100%	0	0%
<b>Organisation (e.g. schools, charities, social enterprise, trade organisations, government bodies)</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	81	66%
<b>Councillor / Elected Official</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	43	34%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3858</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>441</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100%</b>

#### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Member of the public</b>	27	59%	4	15%	35	24%	233	89%
<b>Business (including self-employed and sole traders)</b>	15	33%	13	48%	102	71%	23	9%
<b>Hackney / private hire vehicle - driver / operator</b>	4	9%	9	33%	2	1%	2	1%
<b>Organisation (e.g. schools, charities, social enterprise, trade organisations, government bodies)</b>	0	0%	1	4%	4	3%	4	2%
<b>Councillor / Elected Official</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Member of the public</b>	17	40%	293	49%	14	7%	2	1%
<b>Business (including self-employed and sole traders)</b>	15	35%	283	47%	13	6%	18	11%
<b>Hackney/private hire vehicle - driver/operator</b>	4	9%	4	1%	172	86%	142	86%
<b>Organisation (e.g. schools, charities, social enterprise, trade organisations, government bodies)</b>	7	16%	16	3%	2	1%	2	1%
<b>Councillor/elected official</b>	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	1	1%
<b>Base</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Are you authorised to respond on behalf of this organisation?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	0	0%	388	95%	21	100%	58	97%
<b>No</b>	0	0%	22	5%	0	0%	2	3%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	17	100%	23	100%	105	99%	26	93%
<b>No</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	2	7%
<b>Base</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	23	96%	285	98%	22	96%	6	32%
<b>No</b>	1	4%	6	2%	1	4%	13	68%
<b>Base</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>291</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Before this consultation, were you aware of the legal requirement placed on Greater Manchester from Government to introduce plans to tackle air pollution and to introduce a category C charging Clean Air Zone?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	1427	46%	252	60%	245	74%	65	73%
<b>No</b>	1703	54%	168	40%	87	26%	24	27%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3130</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>420</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	32	70%	22	81%	100	70%	139	53%
<b>No</b>	12	26%	5	19%	43	30%	123	47%
<b>Base</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	27	63%	322	54%	133	66%	130	79%
<b>No</b>	16	37%	274	46%	67	33%	35	21%
<b>Base</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Do you currently own/lease or drive any of the following vehicles?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bus</b>	27	1%	15	4%	4	1%	0	0%
<b>Coach</b>	4	0%	13	3%	9	3%	1	1%
<b>Minibus</b>	17	1%	15	4%	4	1%	7	8%
<b>HGV Leisure</b>	233	7%	23	5%	2	1%	4	4%
<b>LGV</b>	293	9%	283	67%	4	1%	18	20%
<b>HGV</b>	35	1%	102	24%	2	1%	4	4%
<b>PHV</b>	14	0%	13	3%	172	51%	2	2%
<b>Hackney</b>	2	0%	18	4%	142	43%	3	3%
<b>Private car or motorbike</b>	2478	79%	217	51%	46	14%	56	62%
<b>Other vehicle</b>	70	2%	17	4%	1	0%	5	5%
<b>None</b>	414	13%	7	2%	7	2%	21	23%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3146</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bus</b>	46	100%	1	1%	3	1%	14	52%
<b>Coach</b>	14	30%	2	2%	2	1%	27	100%
<b>Minibus</b>	9	20%	7	8%	5	2%	8	30%
<b>HGV Leisure</b>	3	7%	7	8%	262	100%	2	7%
<b>LGV</b>	13	28%	23	25%	49	19%	12	44%
<b>HGV</b>	1	2%	6	6%	18	7%	1	4%
<b>PHV</b>	7	15%	2	2%	4	2%	7	26%
<b>Hackney</b>	1	2%	1	1%	4	2%	1	4%
<b>Private car or motorbike</b>	25	54%	63	68%	148	56%	8	30%
<b>Other vehicle</b>	1	2%	93	100%	7	3%	2	7%
<b>None</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bus</b>	0	0%	9	21%	13	2%	1	1%
<b>Coach</b>	0	0%	8	19%	12	2%	1	1%
<b>Minibus</b>	0	0%	43	100%	21	4%	5	3%
<b>HGV Leisure</b>	0	0%	5	12%	49	8%	18	13%
<b>LGV</b>	0	0%	21	49%	598	100%	77	54%
<b>HGV</b>	0	0%	5	12%	77	13%	143	100%
<b>PHV</b>	0	0%	10	23%	8	1%	4	3%
<b>Hackney</b>	0	0%	2	5%	3	1%	3	2%
<b>Private car or motorbike</b>	0	0%	26	60%	332	56%	78	55%
<b>Other vehicle</b>	0	0%	7	16%	23	4%	6	4%
<b>None</b>	449	100%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>449</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Under the current proposals would you have to pay a charge for your bus to travel in the Clean Air Zone?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	13	50%	10	67%	3	75%	0	0%
<b>No</b>	6	23%	5	33%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	5	19%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	2	8%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	26	58%	9	64%	0	0%	2	67%
<b>No</b>	11	24%	2	14%	1	100%	1	33%
<b>Don't know</b>	5	11%	2	14%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	3	7%	1	7%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	5	56%	7	54%	6	86%	0	0%
<b>No</b>	2	22%	4	31%	1	14%	1	100%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	22%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Why will you not have a to pay a charge to travel in the Clean Air Zone? Bus

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	1	17%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	2	33%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	2	33%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	17%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	2	18%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	1	9%	1	50%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	3	27%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	18%	1	50%	1	100%	1	100%
<b>Base</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	1	50%	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	50%	1	25%	1	100%	1	100%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Under the current proposals would you have to pay a charge for your coach to travel in the Clean Air Zone?

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	2	50%	12	92%	9	100%	0	0%
<b>No</b>	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	50%	0	0%	0	0%	1	100%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	11	79%	23	85%	0	0%	1	50%
<b>No</b>	1	7%	1	4%	1	100%	1	50%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	14%	3	11%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>



**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	5	63%	9	75%	5	71%	0	0%
<b>No</b>	1	13%	1	8%	1	14%	1	100%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	25%	2	17%	1	14%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Why will you not have to pay a charge to travel in the Clean Air Zone? Coach****Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	1	100%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%	1	100%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Under the current proposals would you have to pay a charge for your minibus to travel in the Clean Air Zone?****Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	10	59%	8	62%	4	100%	5	71%
<b>No</b>	1	6%	4	31%	0	0%	1	14%
<b>Don't know</b>	5	29%	0	0%	0	0%	1	14%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	1	6%	1	8%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	4	50%	4	50%	2	50%	2	40%
<b>No</b>	1	13%	2	25%	2	50%	3	60%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	25%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	27	66%	10	53%	7	70%	0	0%
<b>No</b>	6	15%	5	26%	2	20%	2	100%
<b>Don't know</b>	6	15%	4	21%	1	10%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	2	5%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Why will you not have to pay a charge to travel in the Clean Air Zone? Minibus**

**Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	1	100%	3	75%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%	1	100%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%	2	67%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	100%	1	50%	1	50%	1	33%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	4	67%	4	80%	1	50%	1	50%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	33%	1	20%	1	50%	1	50%
<b>Base</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Under the current proposals would you have to pay a charge for your HGV Leisure to travel in the Clean Air Zone?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	199	85%	17	74%	1	50%	3	75%
<b>No</b>	10	4%	5	22%	1	50%	1	25%
<b>Don't know</b>	24	10%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>233</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	2	67%	0	0%	14	78%	220	84%
<b>No</b>	1	33%	2	100%	4	22%	17	6%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	25	10%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	1	20%	39	80%	1	25%	2	50%
<b>No</b>	4	80%	8	16%	3	75%	2	50%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	2	4%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Why will you not have a to pay a charge to travel in the Clean Air Zone? HGV Leisure

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	4	40%	2	40%	1	100%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	4	40%	1	20%	0	0%	1	100%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	20%	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	1	6%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	1	50%	1	25%	7	41%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	6	35%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	100%	1	50%	1	25%	3	18%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	1	13%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	3	75%	3	38%	2	67%	1	50%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	3	38%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	25%	1	13%	1	33%	1	50%
<b>Base</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Under the current proposals would you have to pay a charge for your van/light goods vehicle (LGV) to travel in the Clean Air Zone?****Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	219	76%	246	87%	2	50%	15	83%
<b>No</b>	36	12%	24	9%	2	50%	2	11%
<b>Don't know</b>	32	11%	12	4%	0	0%	1	6%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>290</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>282</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	5	38%	7	58%	61	80%	40	82%
<b>No</b>	5	38%	3	25%	10	13%	7	14%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	15%	2	17%	4	5%	1	2%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	1	8%	0	0%	1	1%	1	2%
<b>Base</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	10	50%	482	81%	5	63%	0	0%
<b>No</b>	4	20%	64	11%	2	25%	3	100%
<b>Don't know</b>	6	30%	45	8%	1	13%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>594</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Why will you not have to pay a charge to travel in the Clean Air Zone? LGV

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	2	6%	2	8%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	21	58%	20	83%	2	100%	2	100%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	8	22%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	5	14%	1	4%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	10%	1	14%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	3	60%	2	67%	8	80%	5	71%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	20%	1	33%	1	10%	1	14%
<b>Base</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>



### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	4	6%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	2	50%	45	70%	1	50%	2	67%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	1	25%	9	14%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	25%	6	9%	1	50%	1	33%
<b>Base</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Under the current proposals would you have to pay a charge for your heavy goods vehicle (HGV) to travel in the Clean Air Zone?

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	22	63%	85	86%	1	50%	3	75%
<b>No</b>	5	14%	8	8%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	6	17%	6	6%	1	50%	1	25%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	2	6%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	0	0%	0	0%	111	79%	15	83%
<b>No</b>	1	100%	1	100%	13	9%	2	11%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	0	0%	14	10%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	1	6%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	1	25%	61	82%	2	50%	2	67%
<b>No</b>	2	50%	7	9%	1	25%	1	33%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	25%	5	7%	1	25%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Why will you not have to pay a charge to travel in the Clean Air Zone? HGV**

**Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	1	20%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	2	40%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	2	40%	6	75%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	2	25%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	8%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	15%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	0	0%	8	62%	1	50%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	100%	1	100%	2	15%	1	50%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	1	50%	6	86%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	50%	1	14%	1	100%	1	100%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Under the current proposals would you have to pay a charge for your private hire vehicle to travel in the Clean Air Zone?

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	7	54%	8	62%	101	59%	1	50%
<b>No</b>	4	31%	4	31%	45	26%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	15%	1	8%	25	15%	1	50%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	5	83%	5	71%	0	0%	1	25%
<b>No</b>	1	17%	1	14%	4	100%	3	75%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	1	14%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	7	70%	4	50%	117	59%	3	50%
<b>No</b>	2	20%	2	25%	53	27%	3	50%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	10%	2	25%	29	15%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable / don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Why will you not have to pay a charge to travel in the Clean Air Zone? Private hire vehicle

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	3	7%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	3	75%	2	50%	21	47%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	1	25%	11	24%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	1	25%	10	22%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	50%	2	67%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	100%	1	100%	1	25%	1	33%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	3	6%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	1	50%	1	50%	26	49%	2	67%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	12	23%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	50%	1	50%	11	21%	1	33%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Under the current proposals would you have to pay a charge for your hackney to travel in the Clean Air Zone?

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	1	50%	15	83%	109	77%	2	67%
<b>No</b>	0	0%	3	17%	25	18%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	50%	0	0%	8	6%	1	33%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	33%	2	50%
<b>No</b>	1	100%	1	100%	2	67%	2	50%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	0	0%	1	33%	3	50%	127	77%
<b>No</b>	2	100%	2	67%	3	50%	28	17%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	10	6%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Why will you not have to pay a charge to travel in the Clean Air Zone? Hackney

## Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	9%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	1	33%	16	73%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	1	33%	2	9%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	1	33%	2	9%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%	1	50%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	100%	1	100%	1	50%	1	50%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	8%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	1	50%	1	50%	2	67%	17	68%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	3	12%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	50%	1	50%	1	33%	3	12%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Under the current proposals would you have to pay a charge for your Other type of Vehicle to travel in the Clean Air Zone?****Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	22	31%	8	47%	1	100%	1	20%
<b>No</b>	23	32%	6	35%	0	0%	2	40%
<b>Don't know</b>	26	37%	3	18%	0	0%	2	40%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	20%	1	14%
<b>No</b>	1	100%	1	50%	3	60%	3	43%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	1	50%	1	20%	3	43%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	2	29%	8	36%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>No</b>	3	43%	6	27%	1	50%	1	100%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	29%	8	36%	1	50%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable/don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Why will you not have to pay a charge to travel in the Clean Air Zone? Other vehicle

## Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	2	9%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	7	30%	1	17%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	12	52%	3	50%	0	0%	2	100%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	9%	2	33%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	67%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	100%	1	100%	1	33%	1	33%
<b>Base</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>



### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Don't have a vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) will be compliant</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Vehicle(s) are exempt</b>	2	67%	5	83%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	33%	1	17%	1	100%	1	100%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Buses: Please tell us what you think of the proposed daily charges for each of the vehicles?

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	1553	52%	244	70%	182	75%	28	35%
<b>About right</b>	878	29%	58	17%	24	10%	34	43%
<b>Too little</b>	295	10%	21	6%	11	5%	10	13%
<b>Don't know</b>	277	9%	28	8%	25	10%	8	10%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3003</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>351</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	36	86%	22	85%	81	72%	173	71%
<b>About right</b>	1	2%	1	4%	15	13%	35	14%
<b>Too little</b>	4	10%	2	8%	8	7%	5	2%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	2%	1	4%	9	8%	29	12%
<b>Base</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	26	72%	346	68%	113	72%	84	78%
<b>About right</b>	4	11%	93	18%	18	11%	8	7%
<b>Too little</b>	3	8%	31	6%	7	4%	5	5%
<b>Don't know</b>	3	8%	40	8%	20	13%	11	10%
<b>Base</b>	36	100%	510	100%	158	100%	108	100%

### Coaches: Please tell us what you think of the proposed daily charges for each of the vehicles?

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	1204	43%	228	69%	130	73%	21	28%
<b>About right</b>	991	36%	56	17%	26	15%	34	45%
<b>Too little</b>	345	12%	20	6%	7	4%	12	16%
<b>Don't know</b>	246	9%	28	8%	16	9%	8	11%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2786</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	32	86%	22	85%	79	76%	133	64%
<b>About right</b>	2	5%	0	0%	9	9%	43	21%
<b>Too little</b>	3	8%	2	8%	8	8%	8	4%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	2	8%	8	8%	24	12%
<b>Base</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	25	68%	301	64%	75	67%	65	76%
<b>About right</b>	6	16%	99	21%	22	20%	9	11%
<b>Too little</b>	3	8%	27	6%	6	5%	3	4%
<b>Don't know</b>	3	8%	40	9%	9	8%	8	9%
<b>Base</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100%</b>

### HGV: Please tell us what you think of the proposed daily charges for each of the vehicles?

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	1171	40%	272	74%	137	73%	22	29%
<b>About right</b>	905	31%	51	14%	21	11%	28	36%
<b>Too little</b>	644	22%	18	5%	13	7%	20	26%
<b>Don't know</b>	223	8%	25	7%	17	9%	7	9%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2943</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>366</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	25	64%	15	60%	124	91%	201	80%
<b>About right</b>	7	18%	5	20%	5	4%	27	11%
<b>Too little</b>	4	10%	2	8%	5	4%	8	3%
<b>Don't know</b>	3	8%	3	12%	2	1%	15	6%
<b>Base</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	24	65%	366	71%	82	67%	69	78%
<b>About right</b>	8	22%	89	17%	19	15%	7	8%
<b>Too little</b>	2	5%	26	5%	8	7%	7	8%
<b>Don't know</b>	3	8%	38	7%	14	11%	5	6%
<b>Base</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>519</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>100%</b>

**LGV: Please tell us what you think of the proposed daily charges for each of the vehicles?**

**Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	1194	40%	293	75%	145	76%	31	37%
<b>About right</b>	979	33%	65	17%	28	15%	40	48%
<b>Too little</b>	622	21%	21	5%	6	3%	8	10%
<b>Don't know</b>	182	6%	14	4%	12	6%	4	5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2977</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>191</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	13	34%	9	38%	85	66%	169	71%
<b>About right</b>	18	47%	10	42%	35	27%	45	19%
<b>Too little</b>	5	13%	3	13%	5	4%	8	3%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	5%	2	8%	3	2%	17	7%
<b>Base</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	26	68%	476	82%	89	71%	72	81%
<b>About right</b>	10	26%	77	13%	26	21%	8	9%
<b>Too little</b>	1	3%	16	3%	4	3%	2	2%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	3%	11	2%	6	5%	7	8%
<b>Base</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>580</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>125</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Minibuses: Please tell us what you think of the proposed daily charges for each of the vehicles?**

**Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	1126	38%	224	66%	162	81%	26	33%
<b>About right</b>	1114	38%	71	21%	21	10%	40	50%
<b>Too little</b>	498	17%	21	6%	7	3%	7	9%
<b>Don't know</b>	206	7%	23	7%	11	5%	7	9%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2944</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>339</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	17	45%	12	48%	63	59%	154	66%
<b>About right</b>	16	42%	8	32%	30	28%	50	22%
<b>Too little</b>	3	8%	3	12%	7	7%	9	4%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	5%	2	8%	7	7%	19	8%
<b>Base</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	25	66%	348	69%	103	77%	76	82%
<b>About right</b>	10	26%	98	20%	20	15%	7	8%
<b>Too little</b>	1	3%	26	5%	3	2%	4	4%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	5%	30	6%	7	5%	6	6%
<b>Base</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Hackney: Please tell us what you think of the proposed daily charges for each of the vehicles?

## Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	1200	40%	216	62%	229	88%	25	31%
<b>About right</b>	990	33%	65	19%	15	6%	38	48%
<b>Too little</b>	566	19%	44	13%	5	2%	10	13%
<b>Don't know</b>	209	7%	23	7%	10	4%	7	9%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2965</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>348</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	16	44%	9	38%	56	51%	148	64%
<b>About right</b>	10	28%	6	25%	27	25%	48	21%
<b>Too little</b>	7	19%	4	17%	19	17%	17	7%
<b>Don't know</b>	3	8%	5	21%	7	6%	19	8%
<b>Base</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>232</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	23	62%	317	63%	108	81%	148	93%
<b>About right</b>	6	16%	100	20%	14	11%	5	3%
<b>Too little</b>	5	14%	59	12%	3	2%	3	2%
<b>Don't know</b>	3	8%	29	6%	8	6%	3	2%
<b>Base</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>505</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Private hire vehicle: Please tell us what you think of the proposed daily charges for each of the vehicles?**

**Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	1220	41%	215	63%	216	87%	27	34%
<b>About right</b>	969	33%	66	19%	19	8%	36	45%
<b>Too little</b>	592	20%	43	13%	8	3%	9	11%
<b>Don't know</b>	188	6%	20	6%	5	2%	8	10%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2969</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	17	46%	10	40%	57	53%	151	65%
<b>About right</b>	9	24%	5	20%	27	25%	46	20%
<b>Too little</b>	8	22%	6	24%	18	17%	16	7%
<b>Don't know</b>	3	8%	4	16%	5	5%	18	8%
<b>Base</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>231</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Too much</b>	24	65%	327	65%	153	87%	85	86%
<b>About right</b>	6	16%	91	18%	15	9%	6	6%
<b>Too little</b>	4	11%	60	12%	2	1%	7	7%
<b>Don't know</b>	3	8%	26	5%	6	3%	1	1%
<b>Base</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>504</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100%</b>

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the permanent local exemptions proposed by Greater Manchester?**

**Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	1325	42%	183	45%	136	41%	42	49%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	716	23%	50	12%	23	7%	20	23%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	334	11%	63	15%	41	12%	11	13%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	220	7%	21	5%	15	5%	4	5%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	327	10%	49	12%	76	23%	3	3%
<b>Don't know</b>	94	3%	20	5%	32	10%	1	1%
<b>Not applicable</b>	103	3%	24	6%	9	3%	5	6%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3119</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	12	28%	8	30%	68	49%	116	44%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	7	16%	5	19%	17	12%	39	15%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	6	14%	6	22%	19	14%	29	11%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	7	16%	4	15%	7	5%	8	3%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	6	14%	3	11%	17	12%	47	18%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	2%	0	0%	5	4%	17	7%
<b>Not applicable</b>	4	9%	1	4%	7	5%	5	2%
<b>Base</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	15	38%	240	41%	74	37%	89	54%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	9	23%	77	13%	17	9%	8	5%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	8	20%	98	17%	18	9%	21	13%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	4	10%	32	5%	11	6%	6	4%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	1	3%	78	13%	53	27%	26	16%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	3%	31	5%	22	11%	9	5%
<b>Not applicable</b>	2	5%	35	6%	4	2%	6	4%
<b>Base</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>591</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>100%</b>

## To what extent do you agree or disagree with the temporary local exemptions proposed by Greater Manchester?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	1325	42%	183	45%	136	41%	42	49%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	716	23%	50	12%	23	7%	20	23%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	334	11%	63	15%	41	12%	11	13%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	220	7%	21	5%	15	5%	4	5%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	327	10%	49	12%	76	23%	3	3%
<b>Don't know</b>	94	3%	20	5%	32	10%	1	1%
<b>Not applicable</b>	103	3%	24	6%	9	3%	5	6%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3119</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>410</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	18	43%	14	52%	62	45%	110	42%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	9	21%	4	15%	17	12%	33	13%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	4	10%	0	0%	17	12%	43	16%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	1	2%	1	4%	10	7%	15	6%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	5	12%	7	26%	24	17%	35	13%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	0	0%	4	3%	14	5%
<b>Not applicable</b>	5	12%	1	4%	5	4%	11	4%
<b>Base</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	19	49%	291	49%	73	37%	58	36%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	8	21%	68	12%	20	10%	3	2%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	2	5%	77	13%	18	9%	13	8%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	2	5%	25	4%	8	4%	4	2%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	5	13%	86	15%	61	31%	63	39%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	5%	19	3%	12	6%	19	12%
<b>Not applicable</b>	1	3%	23	4%	4	2%	2	1%
<b>Base</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>589</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>100%</b>

**To what extent do you agree or disagree with the permanent local discounts proposed by Greater Manchester?**

**Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	819	26%	123	30%	122	37%	28	32%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	507	16%	44	11%	23	7%	19	22%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	432	14%	67	16%	31	9%	10	11%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	370	12%	16	4%	14	4%	13	15%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	671	22%	94	23%	82	25%	9	10%
<b>Don't know</b>	187	6%	36	9%	35	11%	3	3%
<b>Not applicable</b>	114	4%	31	8%	20	6%	5	6%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3100</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	10	24%	5	19%	40	29%	135	52%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	5	12%	4	15%	14	10%	27	10%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	8	19%	4	15%	20	14%	37	14%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	4	10%	3	11%	9	7%	6	2%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	6	14%	5	19%	34	25%	33	13%
<b>Don't know</b>	5	12%	3	11%	7	5%	12	5%
<b>Not applicable</b>	4	10%	3	11%	14	10%	10	4%
<b>Base</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>260</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	18	46%	186	32%	82	41%	59	36%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	7	18%	70	12%	20	10%	8	5%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	5	13%	94	16%	19	10%	13	8%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	4	10%	30	5%	6	3%	10	6%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	3	8%	123	21%	45	23%	41	25%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	45	8%	17	9%	21	13%
<b>Not applicable</b>	2	5%	40	7%	9	5%	10	6%
<b>Base</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>100%</b>

## CLEAN BUS FUND: Do you believe you are eligible to access this fund?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	39	1%	37	9%	73	23%	7	8%
<b>No</b>	1716	56%	184	46%	74	23%	44	52%
<b>Don't know</b>	181	6%	45	11%	88	28%	4	5%
<b>Not applicable</b>	1149	37%	136	34%	85	27%	29	35%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3085</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	5	12%	4	15%	11	8%	6	2%
<b>No</b>	17	40%	17	63%	69	50%	148	58%
<b>Don't know</b>	5	12%	2	7%	16	12%	31	12%
<b>Not applicable</b>	16	37%	4	15%	43	31%	72	28%
<b>Base</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	4	10%	26	5%	27	14%	56	35%
<b>No</b>	19	48%	302	53%	48	25%	27	17%
<b>Don't know</b>	6	15%	65	11%	65	34%	35	22%
<b>Not applicable</b>	11	28%	182	32%	54	28%	41	26%
<b>Base</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>100%</b>

**CLEAN BUS FUND: Would the proposed fund meet your needs e.g. support you to upgrade your vehicle(s)?****Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	15	38%	7	19%	24	34%	1	14%
<b>No</b>	5	13%	6	16%	17	24%	1	14%
<b>Don't know</b>	19	49%	24	65%	30	42%	5	71%
<b>Base</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	3	60%	2	50%	5	45%	0	0%
<b>No</b>	0	0%	0	0%	3	27%	2	33%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	40%	2	50%	3	27%	4	67%
<b>Base</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	1	25%	8	31%	9	36%	12	21%
<b>No</b>	1	25%	7	27%	5	20%	11	20%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	50%	11	42%	11	44%	33	59%
<b>Base</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>100%</b>

## CLEAN COMMERCIAL VEHICLE FUND: Do you believe you are eligible to access this fund?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	73	2%	167	41%	72	22%	13	15%
<b>No</b>	1659	54%	106	26%	60	19%	37	43%
<b>Don't know</b>	195	6%	81	20%	115	36%	6	7%
<b>Not applicable</b>	1144	37%	55	13%	74	23%	31	36%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3071</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>409</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	2	5%	5	19%	38	27%	16	6%
<b>No</b>	17	41%	13	48%	53	38%	158	61%
<b>Don't know</b>	8	20%	4	15%	27	19%	34	13%
<b>Not applicable</b>	14	34%	5	19%	22	16%	49	19%
<b>Base</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	10	26%	159	27%	35	18%	50	32%
<b>No</b>	10	26%	224	38%	40	21%	20	13%
<b>Don't know</b>	9	24%	112	19%	72	37%	54	34%
<b>Not applicable</b>	9	24%	87	15%	46	24%	34	22%
<b>Base</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>582</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100%</b>

## CLEAN COMMERCIAL VEHICLE FUND: Would the proposed fund meet your needs e.g. support you to upgrade your vehicle(s)?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	20	27%	27	16%	20	29%	5	38%
<b>No</b>	25	34%	48	29%	23	33%	3	23%
<b>Don't know</b>	28	38%	90	55%	26	38%	5	38%
<b>Base</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	1	50%	1	20%	10	26%	3	20%
<b>No</b>	0	0%	0	0%	12	32%	6	40%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	50%	4	80%	16	42%	6	40%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	4	40%	27	17%	10	30%	10	20%
<b>No</b>	3	30%	53	34%	10	30%	17	35%
<b>Don't know</b>	3	30%	77	49%	13	39%	22	45%
<b>Base</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>100%</b>



**CLEAN TAXI FUND: Do you believe you are eligible to access either of these funds?****Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	16	1%	16	4%	169	51%	3	4%
<b>No</b>	1603	53%	151	40%	47	14%	39	46%
<b>Don't know</b>	91	3%	34	9%	92	28%	4	5%
<b>Not applicable</b>	1309	43%	176	47%	22	7%	39	46%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3019</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>377</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	0	0%	0	0%	3	2%	2	1%
<b>No</b>	11	28%	16	59%	50	38%	134	56%
<b>Don't know</b>	3	8%	2	7%	14	11%	14	6%
<b>Not applicable</b>	25	64%	9	33%	63	48%	89	37%
<b>Base</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>239</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	3	8%	3	1%	81	41%	103	63%
<b>No</b>	11	29%	260	48%	31	16%	11	7%
<b>Don't know</b>	4	11%	34	6%	63	32%	40	24%
<b>Not applicable</b>	20	53%	250	46%	22	11%	10	6%
<b>Base</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>547</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>100%</b>

## CLEAN TAXI FUND: Would the proposed funds/'try before you buy' meet your needs e.g. support you to upgrade your vehicle(s)?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	7	47%	4	25%	62	37%	0	0%
<b>No</b>	4	27%	1	6%	50	30%	1	33%
<b>Don't know</b>	4	27%	11	69%	55	33%	2	67%
<b>Base</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>167</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	0	0%	0	0%	3	100%	1	50%
<b>No</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	2	67%	1	33%	41	51%	20	20%
<b>No</b>	0	0%	1	33%	16	20%	37	37%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	33%	1	33%	24	30%	44	44%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100%</b>

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed vehicle finance offer would meet your needs e.g. support you to upgrade your vehicle(s)?**

**Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	19	24%	33	20%	62	33%	2	13%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	6	8%	20	12%	19	10%	5	33%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	9	12%	26	16%	22	12%	1	7%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	5	6%	8	5%	14	7%	0	0%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	15	19%	35	21%	44	23%	3	20%
<b>Don't know</b>	12	15%	30	18%	27	14%	2	13%
<b>Not applicable</b>	12	15%	14	8%	2	1%	2	13%
<b>Base</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	0	0%	2	40%	9	24%	5	31%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	1	50%	1	20%	8	22%	0	0%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	1	50%	1	20%	2	5%	3	19%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	0	0%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	0	0%	0	0%	7	19%	4	25%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	1	20%	7	19%	2	13%
<b>Not applicable</b>	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	2	13%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	0	0%	29	18%	34	37%	27	23%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	2	18%	22	14%	10	11%	10	9%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	1	9%	25	16%	14	15%	9	8%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	1	9%	9	6%	7	8%	8	7%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	2	18%	37	24%	15	16%	32	28%
<b>Don't know</b>	4	36%	22	14%	11	12%	24	21%
<b>Not applicable</b>	1	9%	13	8%	0	0%	6	5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Do you support a hardship fund?

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	2000	66%	303	75%	222	67%	72	84%
<b>No</b>	575	19%	43	11%	34	10%	8	9%
<b>Don't know</b>	470	15%	59	15%	74	22%	6	7%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3045</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	26	65%	19	73%	95	68%	166	66%
<b>No</b>	9	23%	3	12%	23	17%	36	14%
<b>Don't know</b>	5	13%	4	15%	21	15%	48	19%
<b>Base</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	34	89%	399	70%	117	60%	138	84%
<b>No</b>	3	8%	80	14%	22	11%	7	4%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	3%	89	16%	57	29%	20	12%
<b>Base</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>100%</b>

**To what extent do you agree or disagree that air quality needs to be improved in Greater Manchester?****Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	1833	59%	130	31%	87	26%	60	71%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	473	15%	82	20%	36	11%	8	9%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	353	11%	85	21%	73	22%	5	6%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	121	4%	23	6%	19	6%	3	4%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	302	10%	77	19%	91	28%	7	8%
<b>Don't know</b>	31	1%	16	4%	24	7%	2	2%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3113</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>413</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	18	43%	12	44%	35	25%	53	21%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	10	24%	6	22%	30	21%	76	29%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	5	12%	4	15%	40	28%	72	28%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	2	5%	2	7%	7	5%	20	8%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	5	12%	1	4%	23	16%	33	13%
<b>Don't know</b>	2	5%	2	7%	6	4%	4	2%
<b>Base</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Strongly agree</b>	17	44%	173	29%	64	32%	27	16%
<b>Slightly agree</b>	9	23%	137	23%	26	13%	17	10%
<b>Neither agree nor disagree</b>	6	15%	131	22%	37	19%	37	22%
<b>Slightly disagree</b>	1	3%	33	6%	9	5%	12	7%
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	3	8%	101	17%	49	25%	57	35%
<b>Don't know</b>	3	8%	12	2%	12	6%	15	9%
<b>Base</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>587</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>197</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>100%</b>

## How confident are you that the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan would bring roadside nitrogen dioxide (NO2) levels within legal limits in the shortest possible time?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Very confident</b>	146	5%	19	5%	28	8%	9	10%
<b>Fairly confident</b>	931	30%	66	16%	50	15%	24	28%
<b>Neither</b>	456	15%	73	18%	58	18%	10	12%
<b>Fairly unconfident</b>	554	18%	70	17%	42	13%	15	17%
<b>Very unconfident</b>	717	23%	126	31%	80	24%	19	22%
<b>Don't know</b>	272	9%	53	13%	50	15%	6	7%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	43	1%	5	1%	23	7%	3	3%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3119</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>412</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Very confident</b>	4	10%	2	7%	4	3%	2	1%
<b>Fairly confident</b>	11	26%	5	19%	34	24%	27	10%
<b>Neither</b>	6	14%	5	19%	27	19%	54	21%
<b>Fairly unconfident</b>	5	12%	3	11%	23	16%	54	21%
<b>Very unconfident</b>	12	29%	9	33%	42	30%	75	29%
<b>Don't know</b>	4	10%	3	11%	10	7%	39	15%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	8	3%
<b>Base</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>259</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Very confident</b>	3	8%	21	4%	20	10%	9	5%
<b>Fairly confident</b>	8	21%	78	13%	43	22%	13	8%
<b>Neither</b>	8	21%	99	17%	25	13%	37	23%
<b>Fairly unconfident</b>	5	13%	112	19%	23	12%	19	12%
<b>Very unconfident</b>	8	21%	215	37%	52	26%	33	20%
<b>Don't know</b>	7	18%	57	10%	27	14%	39	24%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	0	0%	6	1%	8	4%	14	9%
<b>Base</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>588</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>164</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Which of the following best reflects your trading status as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic?

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Have continued trading throughout</b>	0	0%	164	40%	43	13%	12	27%
<b>Currently trading, having temporarily paused - but have resumed trading during the pandemic</b>	0	0%	192	47%	167	52%	8	18%
<b>Paused trading</b>	0	0%	49	12%	99	31%	12	27%
<b>Permanently ceased trading</b>	0	0%	1	0%	4	1%	0	0%
<b>Other, please specify</b>	0	0%	5	1%	11	3%	12	27%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Have continued trading throughout</b>	9	50%	5	22%	62	57%	9	32%
<b>Currently trading, having temporarily paused - but have resumed trading during the pandemic</b>	4	22%	12	52%	34	31%	9	32%
<b>Paused trading</b>	4	22%	5	22%	9	8%	9	32%
<b>Permanently ceased trading</b>	1	6%	1	4%	1	1%	1	4%
<b>Other, please specify</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Have continued trading throughout</b>	11	44%	108	37%	30	17%	13	8%
<b>Currently trading, having temporarily paused - but have resumed trading during the pandemic</b>	10	40%	147	50%	92	51%	92	57%
<b>Paused trading</b>	2	8%	33	11%	53	29%	46	29%
<b>Permanently ceased trading</b>	1	4%	1	0%	1	1%	5	3%
<b>Other, please specify</b>	1	4%	6	2%	4	2%	5	3%
<b>Base</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Have you or your business received any of the following as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Job Retention Scheme</b>	0	0%	147	38%	29	9%	12	29%
<b>Government-backed accredited loans or finance agreements</b>	0	0%	101	26%	25	8%	2	5%
<b>Business grants funded by the UK and devolved governments</b>	0	0%	59	15%	14	5%	8	20%
<b>Self-employment income support scheme</b>	0	0%	104	27%	201	65%	5	12%
<b>Other government support</b>	0	0%	14	4%	31	10%	4	10%
<b>Other loans or grants</b>	0	0%	15	4%	5	2%	5	12%
<b>Not applied for any of these schemes</b>	0	0%	87	23%	45	15%	20	49%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Job Retention Scheme</b>	12	71%	5	25%	5	21%	18	82%
<b>Government-backed accredited loans or finance agreements</b>	6	35%	3	15%	5	21%	13	59%
<b>Business grants funded by the UK and devolved governments</b>	4	24%	2	10%	1	4%	3	14%
<b>Self-employment income support scheme</b>	2	12%	3	15%	5	21%	3	14%
<b>Other government support</b>	3	18%	3	15%	2	8%	0	0%
<b>Other loans or grants</b>	1	6%	3	15%	1	4%	0	0%
<b>Not applied for any of these schemes</b>	0	0%	8	40%	11	46%	1	5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Job Retention Scheme</b>	4	17%	16	73%	113	40%	61	60%
<b>Government-backed accredited loans or finance agreements</b>	2	9%	2	9%	79	28%	36	35%
<b>Business grants funded by the UK and devolved governments</b>	3	13%	5	23%	46	16%	13	13%
<b>Self-employment income support scheme</b>	3	13%	4	18%	72	25%	14	14%
<b>Other government support</b>	1	4%	3	14%	10	4%	5	5%
<b>Other loans or grants</b>	0	0%	3	14%	14	5%	5	5%
<b>Not applied for any of these schemes</b>	12	52%	2	9%	62	22%	15	15%
<b>Base</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Level of debt: Please tell us how the Covid-19 pandemic has affected the following aspects of your business

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	0	0%	8	2%	44	14%	1	2%
<b>Less than before</b>	0	0%	12	3%	4	1%	0	0%
<b>Same as before</b>	0	0%	97	25%	27	9%	9	21%
<b>More than before</b>	0	0%	87	23%	53	17%	5	12%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	0	0%	100	26%	137	44%	10	24%
<b>Not applicable</b>	0	0%	48	12%	15	5%	14	33%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	5	1%	9	3%	1	2%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	0	0%	28	7%	25	8%	2	5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>314</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	1	6%	0	0%	4	4%	2	7%
<b>Less than before</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%
<b>Same as before</b>	6	35%	4	18%	24	23%	4	14%
<b>More than before</b>	1	6%	1	5%	24	23%	6	21%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	4	24%	12	55%	30	29%	7	25%
<b>Not applicable</b>	2	12%	4	18%	8	8%	5	18%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	6%	1	5%	2	2%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	2	12%	0	0%	11	10%	4	14%
<b>Base</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	0	0%	7	2%	25	14%	17	12%
<b>Less than before</b>	1	4%	7	2%	3	2%	1	1%
<b>Same as before</b>	7	29%	71	25%	14	8%	13	9%
<b>More than before</b>	2	8%	61	21%	37	21%	22	15%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	5	21%	80	28%	60	35%	76	53%
<b>Not applicable</b>	3	13%	34	12%	12	7%	6	4%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	4%	7	2%	6	3%	2	1%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	5	21%	20	7%	16	9%	6	4%
<b>Base</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>287</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Reserves/Savings: Please tell us how the Covid-19 pandemic has affected the following aspects of your business

## Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	0	0%	122	34%	131	55%	9	22%
<b>Less than before</b>	0	0%	110	31%	42	18%	7	17%
<b>Same as before</b>	0	0%	53	15%	8	3%	8	20%
<b>More than before</b>	0	0%	12	3%	8	3%	1	2%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	0	0%	16	4%	19	8%	1	2%
<b>Not applicable</b>	0	0%	19	5%	12	5%	12	29%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	4	1%	4	2%	1	2%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	0	0%	21	6%	14	6%	2	5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>238</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	5	31%	10	50%	31	31%	8	32%
<b>Less than before</b>	4	25%	5	25%	29	29%	5	20%
<b>Same as before</b>	3	19%	1	5%	19	19%	5	20%
<b>More than before</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	0	0%	1	5%	6	6%	1	4%
<b>Not applicable</b>	1	6%	2	10%	4	4%	3	12%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	6%	1	5%	3	3%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	2	13%	0	0%	8	8%	3	12%
<b>Base</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	8	35%	90	34%	68	50%	68	61%
<b>Less than before</b>	4	17%	77	29%	29	21%	12	11%
<b>Same as before</b>	5	22%	42	16%	5	4%	5	4%
<b>More than before</b>	0	0%	9	3%	4	3%	4	4%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	0	0%	11	4%	11	8%	10	9%
<b>Not applicable</b>	1	4%	14	5%	7	5%	6	5%
<b>Don't know</b>	1	4%	5	2%	2	1%	2	2%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	4	17%	15	6%	9	7%	5	4%
<b>Base</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>263</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>135</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Turnover: Please tell us how the Covid-19 pandemic has affected the following aspects of your business

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	0	0%	155	42%	195	76%	13	31%
<b>Less than before</b>	0	0%	121	33%	26	10%	7	17%
<b>Same as before</b>	0	0%	33	9%	1	0%	4	10%
<b>More than before</b>	0	0%	18	5%	6	2%	3	7%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	0	0%	17	5%	14	5%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable</b>	0	0%	8	2%	1	0%	13	31%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	4	1%	3	1%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	0	0%	15	4%	11	4%	2	5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>371</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>257</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	15	83%	18	86%	36	36%	10	40%
<b>Less than before</b>	2	11%	0	0%	34	34%	6	24%
<b>Same as before</b>	0	0%	0	0%	8	8%	4	16%
<b>More than before</b>	0	0%	0	0%	4	4%	0	0%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	1	6%	2	10%	6	6%	1	4%
<b>Not applicable</b>	0	0%	1	5%	3	3%	2	8%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	0	0%	0	0%	7	7%	2	8%
<b>Base</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	12	50%	111	41%	100	71%	99	80%
<b>Less than before</b>	8	33%	93	34%	16	11%	10	8%
<b>Same as before</b>	1	4%	22	8%	1	1%	0	0%
<b>More than before</b>	0	0%	14	5%	5	4%	2	2%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	0	0%	13	5%	7	5%	8	6%
<b>Not applicable</b>	1	4%	7	3%	2	1%	0	0%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	5	2%	2	1%	1	1%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	2	8%	9	3%	7	5%	4	3%
<b>Base</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>140</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Profitability: Please tell us how the Covid-19 pandemic has affected the following aspects of your business

#### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	0	0%	150	41%	198	79%	13	31%
<b>Less than before</b>	0	0%	118	32%	23	9%	4	10%
<b>Same as before</b>	0	0%	43	12%	2	1%	8	19%
<b>More than before</b>	0	0%	13	4%	4	2%	0	0%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	0	0%	12	3%	14	6%	0	0%
<b>Not applicable</b>	0	0%	11	3%	1	0%	14	33%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	4	1%	3	1%	1	2%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	0	0%	16	4%	6	2%	2	5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>367</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>251</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	14	82%	18	86%	32	32%	12	46%
<b>Less than before</b>	2	12%	1	5%	38	38%	7	27%
<b>Same as before</b>	0	0%	0	0%	9	9%	1	4%
<b>More than before</b>	0	0%	0	0%	3	3%	0	0%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	0	0%	1	5%	6	6%	1	4%
<b>Not applicable</b>	0	0%	1	5%	3	3%	3	12%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	1	6%	0	0%	7	7%	2	8%
<b>Base</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A lot less than before</b>	13	54%	107	40%	104	76%	99	81%
<b>Less than before</b>	5	21%	90	33%	13	10%	10	8%
<b>Same as before</b>	2	8%	31	11%	2	1%	0	0%
<b>More than before</b>	0	0%	9	3%	4	3%	1	1%
<b>A lot more than before</b>	0	0%	9	3%	8	6%	6	5%
<b>Not applicable</b>	1	4%	9	3%	1	1%	1	1%
<b>Don't know</b>	0	0%	6	2%	1	1%	2	2%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	3	13%	9	3%	3	2%	3	2%
<b>Base</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>136</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Where is your business, charity or organisation registered?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bolton</b>	0	0%	38	9%	47	15%	5	7%
<b>Bury</b>	0	0%	30	7%	14	4%	7	9%
<b>Manchester</b>	0	0%	71	16%	91	29%	21	28%
<b>Oldham</b>	0	0%	40	9%	41	13%	8	11%
<b>Rochdale</b>	0	0%	21	5%	31	10%	7	9%
<b>Salford</b>	0	0%	34	8%	16	5%	9	12%
<b>Stockport</b>	0	0%	49	11%	25	8%	7	9%
<b>Tameside</b>	0	0%	34	8%	20	6%	3	4%
<b>Trafford</b>	0	0%	42	10%	14	4%	8	11%
<b>Wigan</b>	0	0%	55	13%	32	10%	5	7%
<b>Outside Greater Manchester</b>	0	0%	77	18%	12	4%	22	29%
<b>Don't Know</b>	0	0%	6	1%	0	0%	5	7%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>318</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bolton</b>	1	6%	2	9%	5	17%	1	4%
<b>Bury</b>	1	6%	3	14%	3	10%	2	9%
<b>Manchester</b>	3	17%	7	32%	4	14%	2	9%
<b>Oldham</b>	2	11%	6	27%	6	21%	3	13%
<b>Rochdale</b>	1	6%	5	23%	4	14%	2	9%
<b>Salford</b>	2	11%	5	23%	2	7%	4	17%
<b>Stockport</b>	2	11%	3	14%	7	24%	2	9%
<b>Tameside</b>	2	11%	3	14%	4	14%	2	9%
<b>Trafford</b>	1	6%	4	18%	2	7%	1	4%
<b>Wigan</b>	1	6%	5	23%	5	17%	1	4%
<b>Outside Greater Manchester</b>	12	67%	3	14%	9	31%	15	65%
<b>Base</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bolton</b>	3	13%	2	8%	28	9%	11	10%
<b>Bury</b>	2	8%	3	12%	19	6%	9	8%
<b>Manchester</b>	9	38%	6	23%	48	16%	13	12%
<b>Oldham</b>	2	8%	6	23%	24	8%	10	9%
<b>Rochdale</b>	3	13%	3	12%	19	6%	10	9%
<b>Salford</b>	2	8%	4	15%	28	9%	7	6%
<b>Stockport</b>	5	21%	3	12%	35	12%	10	9%
<b>Tameside</b>	1	4%	1	4%	29	10%	4	4%
<b>Trafford</b>	4	17%	2	8%	29	10%	8	7%
<b>Wigan</b>	3	13%	3	12%	43	14%	14	13%
<b>Outside Greater Manchester</b>	7	29%	10	38%	50	17%	35	32%
<b>Base</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100%</b>

## What Sector does your business fall into?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Agriculture, forestry &amp; fishing</b>	0	0%	25	6%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Information &amp; communication</b>	0	0%	12	3%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Mining, quarrying &amp; utilities</b>	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Financial &amp; insurance</b>	0	0%	6	2%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Manufacturing</b>	0	0%	23	6%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Property</b>	0	0%	16	4%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Construction</b>	0	0%	83	21%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Professional, scientific &amp; technical</b>	0	0%	16	4%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Motor trades</b>	0	0%	36	9%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Business administration &amp; support services</b>	0	0%	7	2%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Wholesale</b>	0	0%	13	3%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Public administration &amp; defence</b>	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Retail</b>	0	0%	24	6%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Education</b>	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Transport &amp; storage</b>	0	0%	83	21%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Health</b>	0	0%	5	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Accommodation &amp; food services</b>	0	0%	5	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Arts, entertainment, recreation &amp; other</b>	0	0%	34	9%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Agriculture, forestry &amp; fishing</b>	0	0%	0	0%	7	7%	4	19%
<b>Information &amp; communication</b>	1	7%	1	8%	2	2%	1	5%
<b>Mining, quarrying &amp; utilities</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	2%	1	5%
<b>Financial &amp; insurance</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Manufacturing</b>	0	0%	0	0%	9	9%	0	0%
<b>Property</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Construction</b>	0	0%	0	0%	9	9%	3	14%
<b>Professional, scientific &amp; technical</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	5%
<b>Motor trades</b>	0	0%	0	0%	17	17%	4	19%
<b>Business administration &amp; support services</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Wholesale</b>	0	0%	0	0%	6	6%	0	0%
<b>Public administration &amp; defence</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Retail</b>	0	0%	0	0%	3	3%	2	10%
<b>Education</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%
<b>Transport &amp; storage</b>	13	93%	11	85%	43	42%	4	19%
<b>Health</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Accommodation &amp; food services</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%
<b>Arts, entertainment, recreation &amp; other</b>	0	0%	1	8%	2	2%	1	5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Agriculture, forestry &amp; fishing</b>	0	0%	21	8%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Information &amp; communication</b>	1	7%	5	2%	1	8%	1	20%
<b>Mining, quarrying &amp; utilities</b>	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Financial &amp; insurance</b>	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Manufacturing</b>	1	7%	20	7%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Property</b>	0	0%	14	5%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Construction</b>	0	0%	75	27%	1	8%	0	0%
<b>Professional, scientific &amp; technical</b>	0	0%	8	3%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Motor trades</b>	2	14%	27	10%	2	17%	4	80%
<b>Business administration &amp; support services</b>	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Wholesale</b>	0	0%	10	4%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Public administration &amp; defence</b>	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Retail</b>	0	0%	19	7%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Education</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Transport &amp; storage</b>	10	71%	49	18%	8	67%	0	0%
<b>Health</b>	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Accommodation &amp; food services</b>	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Arts, entertainment, recreation &amp; other</b>	0	0%	20	7%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>

## What is the size of your business?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Sole trader/self-employed (1 person)</b>	0	0%	177	42%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Micro business (2-9 employees)</b>	0	0%	128	30%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Small business (10-49 employees)</b>	0	0%	65	15%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Medium business (50-249 employees)</b>	0	0%	38	9%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Large business (250+ employees)</b>	0	0%	14	3%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>422</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Sole trader/self-employed (1 person)</b>	2	13%	0	0%	13	13%	9	39%
<b>Micro business (2-9 employees)</b>	1	7%	3	23%	31	30%	6	26%
<b>Small business (10-49 employees)</b>	4	27%	7	54%	26	25%	6	26%
<b>Medium business (50-249 employees)</b>	6	40%	3	23%	23	23%	2	9%
<b>Large business (250+ employees)</b>	2	13%	0	0%	9	9%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Sole trader/self-employed (1 person)</b>	0	0%	109	39%	4	31%	15	83%
<b>Micro business (2-9 employees)</b>	2	13%	96	34%	2	15%	1	6%
<b>Small business (10-49 employees)</b>	4	27%	41	14%	4	31%	1	6%
<b>Medium business (50-249 employees)</b>	5	33%	26	9%	3	23%	1	6%
<b>Large business (250+ employees)</b>	4	27%	11	4%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Are you a...

## Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Licensed hackney driver – own vehicle</b>	0	0%		0%	128	39%	0	0%
<b>Licensed hackney driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	13	4%	0	0%
<b>Licensed hackney driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is not kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%
<b>Licensed private hire driver – own vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	152	46%	0	0%
<b>Licensed private hire driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	10	3%	0	0%
<b>Licensed private hire driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is not kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%
<b>Private hire operator</b>	0	0%	0	0%	22	7%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>330</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Licensed hackney driver – own vehicle</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	50%
<b>Licensed hackney driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Licensed hackney driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is not kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Licensed private hire driver – own vehicle</b>	1	25%	0	0%	2	100%	0	0%
<b>Licensed private hire driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Licensed private hire driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is not kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Private hire operator</b>	3	75%	9	100%	0	0%	1	50%
<b>Base</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Licensed hackney driver – own vehicle</b>	0	0%	1	33%	4	2%	125	89%
<b>Licensed hackney driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	12	9%
<b>Licensed hackney driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is not kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%
<b>Licensed private hire driver – own vehicle</b>	1	33%	0	0%	148	87%	1	1%
<b>Licensed private hire driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	7	4%	0	0%
<b>Licensed private hire driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is not kept at my home address</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%
<b>Private hire operator</b>	2	67%	2	67%	9	5%	1	1%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>171</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Which district are you licensed with?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bolton</b>	0	0%	0	0%	51	15%	0	0%
<b>Bury</b>	0	0%	0	0%	15	4%	0	0%
<b>Manchester</b>	0	0%	0	0%	95	28%	0	0%
<b>Oldham</b>	0	0%	0	0%	41	12%	0	0%
<b>Rochdale</b>	0	0%	0	0%	40	12%	0	0%
<b>Salford</b>	0	0%	0	0%	20	6%	0	0%
<b>Stockport</b>	0	0%	0	0%	34	10%	0	0%
<b>Tameside</b>	0	0%	0	0%	25	7%	0	0%
<b>Trafford</b>	0	0%	0	0%	19	6%	0	0%
<b>Wigan</b>	0	0%	0	0%	39	11%	0	0%
<b>Outside Greater Manchester (please write in)</b>	0	0%	0	0%	18	5%	0	0%
<b>Don't Know</b>	0	0%	0	0%	4	1%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bolton</b>	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%
<b>Bury</b>	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%
<b>Manchester</b>	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%
<b>Oldham</b>	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%
<b>Rochdale</b>	1	25%	1	100%	0	0%	2	22%
<b>Salford</b>	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%
<b>Stockport</b>	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%
<b>Tameside</b>	2	50%	0	0%	1	50%	3	33%
<b>Trafford</b>	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%
<b>Wigan</b>	1	25%	0	0%	0	0%	2	22%
<b>Outside Greater Manchester (please write in)</b>	3	75%	0	0%	1	50%	8	89%
<b>Base</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bolton</b>	2	29%	1	25%	2	50%	1	50%
<b>Bury</b>	1	14%	1	25%	1	25%	0	0%
<b>Manchester</b>	4	57%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%
<b>Oldham</b>	1	14%	0	0%	1	25%	1	50%
<b>Rochdale</b>	1	14%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
<b>Salford</b>	1	14%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%
<b>Stockport</b>	1	14%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
<b>Tameside</b>	1	14%	0	0%	1	25%	0	0%
<b>Trafford</b>	1	14%	0	0%	2	50%	0	0%
<b>Wigan</b>	2	29%	2	50%	1	25%	0	0%
<b>Outside Greater Manchester (please write in)</b>	2	29%	1	25%	2	50%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>100%</b>

## How old are you?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Under 13</b>	4	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>13-17</b>	10	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>18-24</b>	71	2%	3	2%	1	0%	1	3%
<b>25-34</b>	435	14%	20	11%	28	8%	3	8%
<b>35-44</b>	588	19%	35	20%	100	30%	1	3%
<b>45-54</b>	605	19%	52	29%	89	27%	6	15%
<b>55-64</b>	685	22%	46	26%	77	23%	14	36%
<b>65-74</b>	478	15%	10	6%	19	6%	11	28%
<b>75+</b>	89	3%	0	0%	2	1%	1	3%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	183	6%	11	6%	18	5%	2	5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3148</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>334</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Under 13</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>13-17</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>18-24</b>	1	3%	0	0%	1	2%	10	4%
<b>25-34</b>	6	18%	4	31%	8	16%	28	11%
<b>35-44</b>	6	18%	3	23%	8	16%	45	18%
<b>45-54</b>	4	12%	1	8%	11	22%	79	32%
<b>55-64</b>	6	18%	4	31%	17	34%	60	25%
<b>65-74</b>	4	12%	0	0%	3	6%	12	5%
<b>75+</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	6	18%	1	8%	1	2%	9	4%
<b>Base</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Under 13</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>13-17</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>18-24</b>	0	0%	5	1%	1	1%	0	0%
<b>25-34</b>	3	14%	60	15%	27	14%	6	4%
<b>35-44</b>	7	33%	92	23%	69	36%	32	20%
<b>45-54</b>	4	19%	104	25%	38	20%	57	36%
<b>55-64</b>	3	14%	93	23%	39	21%	38	24%
<b>65-74</b>	0	0%	27	7%	5	3%	18	11%
<b>75+</b>	1	5%	1	0%	1	1%	1	1%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	3	14%	26	6%	10	5%	8	5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>408</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100%</b>



## How do you describe your gender?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A man (including Trans Man)</b>	1638	53%	121	75%	237	72%	21	55%
<b>A woman (including Trans Woman)</b>	996	32%	15	9%	8	2%	13	34%
<b>Non-binary</b>	26	1%	3	2%	1	0%	0	0%
<b>In another way</b>	29	1%	1	1%	2	1%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	415	13%	21	13%	79	24%	4	11%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3104</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>161</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>327</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A man (including Trans Man)</b>	19	66%	10	77%	35	70%	41	17%
<b>A woman (including Trans Woman)</b>	2	7%	1	8%	9	18%	163	67%
<b>Non-binary</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%
<b>In another way</b>	1	3%	0	0%	1	2%	2	1%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	7	24%	2	15%	5	10%	35	14%
<b>Base</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>A man (including Trans Man)</b>	16	76%	251	63%	138	74%	98	69%
<b>A woman (including Trans Woman)</b>	1	5%	85	21%	7	4%	3	2%
<b>Non-binary</b>	0	0%	3	1%	1	1%	0	0%
<b>In another way</b>	1	5%	2	1%	2	1%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	3	14%	56	14%	39	21%	42	29%
<b>Base</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>397</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>187</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Do you identify as trans/transgender?

## Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	17	1%	0	0%	8	2%	0	0%
<b>No</b>	2678	86%	135	84%	222	69%	33	87%
<b>In some ways</b>	20	1%	2	1%	1	0%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	383	12%	23	14%	93	29%	5	13%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3098</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	0%
<b>No</b>	18	64%	11	85%	42	84%	206	85%
<b>In some ways</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	10	36%	2	15%	6	12%	36	15%
<b>Base</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes</b>	0	0%	3	1%	4	2%	4	3%
<b>No</b>	15	71%	334	84%	133	72%	94	66%
<b>In some ways</b>	0	0%	3	1%	1	1%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	6	29%	58	15%	48	26%	45	31%
<b>Base</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>398</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Which of the following best describes how you think of yourself?

## Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bisexual</b>	94	4%	19	13%	37	19%	1	3%
<b>Gay man</b>	131	5%	0	0%	2	1%	2	6%
<b>Gay woman or lesbian</b>	45	2%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Heterosexual</b>	2170	88%	119	84%	150	79%	30	91%
<b>Other sexual orientation</b>	30	1%	1	1%	1	1%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>2470</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>190</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bisexual</b>	0	0%	0	0%	3	8%	4	2%
<b>Gay man</b>	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	4	2%
<b>Gay woman or lesbian</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	4	2%
<b>Heterosexual</b>	17	100%	9	82%	34	92%	181	93%
<b>Other sexual orientation</b>	0	0%	1	9%	0	0%	1	1%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bisexual</b>	1	7%	15	5%	15	15%	40	36%
<b>Gay man</b>	1	7%	2	1%	3	3%	0	0%
<b>Gay woman or lesbian</b>	0	0%	3	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Heterosexual</b>	12	86%	299	93%	79	81%	71	64%
<b>Other sexual orientation</b>	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>111</b>	<b>100%</b>

## What is your religion?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Buddhist</b>	17	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Christian</b>	1028	33%	62	35%	57	17%	17	44%
<b>Hindu</b>	10	0%	0	0%	2	1%	0	0%
<b>Jewish</b>	24	1%	0	0%	1	0%	1	3%
<b>Muslim</b>	55	2%	17	10%	175	53%	1	3%
<b>Sikh</b>	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Other religion</b>	62	2%	5	3%	0	0%	1	3%
<b>No religion</b>	1406	45%	64	36%	29	9%	12	31%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	510	16%	27	15%	67	20%	7	18%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3113</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Buddhist</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	0%
<b>Christian</b>	7	24%	4	31%	17	35%	105	43%
<b>Hindu</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
<b>Jewish</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Muslim</b>	1	3%	0	0%	2	4%	1	0%
<b>Sikh</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Other religion</b>	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	3	1%
<b>No religion</b>	11	38%	6	46%	16	33%	91	37%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	9	31%	3	23%	12	24%	42	17%
<b>Base</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Buddhist</b>	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Christian</b>	8	38%	137	34%	27	14%	26	16%
<b>Hindu</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	1	1%
<b>Jewish</b>	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	1	1%
<b>Muslim</b>	1	5%	0	0%	100	53%	91	58%
<b>Sikh</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Other religion</b>	0	0%	9	2%	1	1%	1	1%
<b>No religion</b>	7	33%	186	46%	15	8%	15	9%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	5	24%	66	16%	44	23%	23	15%
<b>Base</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100%</b>

## What is your ethnic group?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Asian or Asian British - Indian	10	0%	0	0%	20	6%	0	0%
Asian or Asian British - Pakistani	32	1%	16	9%	117	35%	1	3%
Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi	6	0%	0	0%	10	3%	0	0%
Asian or Asian British - Chinese	9	0%	2	1%	1	0%	0	0%
Asian or Asian British - Kashmiri	0	0%	2	1%	23	7%	0	0%
Asian or Asian British - Any other Asian background	4	0%	0	0%	9	3%	0	0%
Black or Black British - Caribbean	8	0%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%
Black or Black British - African	8	0%	0	0%	6	2%	0	0%
Black or Black British - Any other Black background	6	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Mixed - White and Black Caribbean	9	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Mixed - White and Black African	3	0%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
Mixed - White and Asian	18	1%	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%
Mixed - Any other mixed background	16	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
White - English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	2400	77%	129	73%	86	26%	31	79%
White - Irish	41	1%	1	1%	2	1%	2	5%
White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller	2	0%	2	1%	0	0%	0	0%
White - Eastern European	23	1%	1	1%	0	0%	0	0%
White - Any other White background	122	4%	1	1%	5	2%	0	0%
Other ethnic group - Arab	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Other ethnic group - Other	14	0%	1	1%	2	1%	0	0%
Prefer not to say	392	13%	18	10%	48	15%	5	13%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3125</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Indian</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	1	0%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%	0	0%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Kashmiri</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Any other Asian background</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Black or Black British - Caribbean</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Black or Black British - African</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	2%	0	0%
<b>Black or Black British - Any other Black background</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Mixed - White and Black Caribbean</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Mixed - White and Black African</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Mixed - White and Asian</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	0%
<b>Mixed - Any other mixed background</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>White - English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British</b>	19	66%	11	85%	39	78%	206	85%
<b>White - Irish</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>White - Eastern European</b>	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>White - Any other White background</b>	2	7%	1	8%	0	0%	8	3%
<b>Other ethnic group - Arab</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Other ethnic group - Other</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	7	24%	1	8%	6	12%	27	11%
<b>Base</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>243</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Indian</b>	1	5%	0	0%	19	10%	2	1%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Pakistani</b>	0	0%	0	0%	62	33%	67	42%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Bangladeshi</b>	0	0%	0	0%	10	5%	0	0%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Chinese</b>	1	5%	2	0%	2	1%	0	0%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Kashmiri</b>	0	0%	0	0%	7	4%	18	11%
<b>Asian or Asian British - Any other Asian background</b>	0	0%	0	0%	7	4%	1	1%
<b>Black or Black British - Caribbean</b>	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%	0	0%
<b>Black or Black British - African</b>	0	0%	1	0%	4	2%	2	1%
<b>Black or Black British - Any other Black background</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Mixed - White and Black Caribbean</b>	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Mixed - White and Black African</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Mixed - White and Asian</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	1	1%
<b>Mixed - Any other mixed background</b>	0	0%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>White - English/Welsh/Scottish/Northern Irish/British</b>	14	67%	330	81%	42	22%	43	27%
<b>White - Irish</b>	1	5%	6	1%	0	0%	2	1%
<b>White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller</b>	0	0%	2	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>White - Eastern European</b>	1	5%	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>White - Any other White background</b>	0	0%	9	2%	4	2%	3	2%
<b>Other ethnic group - Arab</b>	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Other ethnic group - Other</b>	0	0%	1	0%	1	1%	1	1%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	3	14%	50	12%	30	16%	18	11%
<b>Base</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes, limited a lot</b>	159	5%	10	6%	6	2%	2	5%
<b>Yes, limited a little</b>	454	15%	18	10%	27	8%	5	13%
<b>No</b>	2211	71%	129	74%	241	73%	29	74%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	289	9%	17	10%	54	16%	3	8%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3113</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes, limited a lot</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%	11	5%
<b>Yes, limited a little</b>	4	14%	1	8%	4	8%	30	12%
<b>No</b>	19	68%	12	92%	38	78%	182	75%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	5	18%	0	0%	5	10%	20	8%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes, limited a lot</b>	0	0%	19	5%	2	1%	5	3%
<b>Yes, limited a little</b>	5	25%	48	12%	15	8%	12	8%
<b>No</b>	13	65%	290	72%	138	74%	116	74%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	2	10%	46	11%	31	17%	24	15%
<b>Base</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0%</b>

## Disability

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Learning disability</b>	27	4%	2	7%	1	3%	0	0%
<b>Mental ill health</b>	112	18%	6	21%	0	0%	0	0%
<b>Mobility disability</b>	284	46%	12	43%	7	21%	5	71%
<b>Sensory disability</b>	47	8%	3	11%	0	0%	1	14%
<b>Other disability</b>	168	27%	9	32%	5	15%	2	29%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	96	16%	3	11%	20	61%	0	0%
<b>Base</b>	<b>613</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Learning disability</b>	0	0%	0	0%	2	5%	0	0%
<b>Mental ill health</b>	0	0%	2	14%	5	12%	0	0%
<b>Mobility disability</b>	1	25%	8	57%	23	56%	0	0%
<b>Sensory disability</b>	0	0%	0	0%	4	10%	0	0%
<b>Other disability</b>	2	50%	5	36%	11	27%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	1	25%	0	0%	3	7%	1	100%
<b>Base</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Learning disability</b>	9	8%	0	0%	3	4%	0	0%
<b>Mental ill health</b>	36	31%	1	20%	11	16%	1	17%
<b>Mobility disability</b>	35	30%	1	20%	33	49%	4	67%
<b>Sensory disability</b>	15	13%	0	0%	5	7%	1	17%
<b>Other disability</b>	40	34%	1	20%	17	25%	0	0%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	12	10%	2	40%	13	19%	1	17%
<b>Base</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Are you more vulnerable to air pollution for health reasons (e.g. pregnant or suffer from asthma or a heart condition)?**

**Respondent type**

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes – it affects me a lot</b>	173	6%	8	5%	6	2%	3	8%
<b>Yes – it affects me a little</b>	561	18%	27	16%	27	8%	6	15%
<b>No</b>	2101	68%	120	70%	246	76%	28	72%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	263	8%	17	10%	45	14%	2	5%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3098</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>172</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>324</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes – it affects me a lot</b>	1	2%	0	0%	1	1%	5	2%
<b>Yes – it affects me a little</b>	5	11%	2	7%	6	4%	34	13%
<b>No</b>	17	37%	11	41%	40	28%	185	71%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	5	11%	0	0%	2	1%	18	7%
<b>Base</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>143</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>262</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Yes – it affects me a lot</b>	0	0%	13	2%	5	2%	3	2%
<b>Yes – it affects me a little</b>	2	5%	57	10%	15	7%	13	8%
<b>No</b>	16	37%	283	47%	134	67%	123	75%
<b>Prefer not to say</b>	2	5%	44	7%	29	14%	18	11%
<b>Base</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>598</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>100%</b>

## Where do you live?

### Respondent type

	General Public		Business		Taxi		Representatives	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bolton</b>	251	7%	12	7%	47	14%	4	10%
<b>Bury</b>	257	7%	8	5%	12	4%	2	5%
<b>Manchester</b>	980	26%	23	13%	66	20%	2	5%
<b>Oldham</b>	190	5%	20	11%	46	14%	5	12%
<b>Rochdale</b>	164	4%	4	2%	38	12%	2	5%
<b>Salford</b>	243	6%	8	5%	14	4%	6	15%
<b>Stockport</b>	516	14%	19	11%	29	9%	5	12%
<b>Tameside</b>	268	7%	16	9%	20	6%	5	12%
<b>Trafford</b>	354	9%	20	11%	14	4%	3	7%
<b>Wigan</b>	295	8%	30	17%	28	9%	3	7%
<b>Outside Greater Manchester (please write in)</b>	277	7%	17	10%	14	4%	4	10%
<b>Base</b>	<b>3795</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>177</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>328</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £60 to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone?**


	Bus		Coach		HGV		HGV Leisure	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bolton</b>	4	13%	0	0%	3	6%	19	8%
<b>Bury</b>	1	3%	0	0%	0	0%	10	4%
<b>Manchester</b>	2	7%	0	0%	1	2%	9	4%
<b>Oldham</b>	4	13%	1	8%	7	14%	17	7%
<b>Rochdale</b>	2	7%	1	8%	4	8%	10	4%
<b>Salford</b>	1	3%	1	8%	4	8%	6	2%
<b>Stockport</b>	3	10%	1	8%	5	10%	22	9%
<b>Tameside</b>	6	20%	1	8%	6	12%	19	8%
<b>Trafford</b>	1	3%	0	0%	1	2%	17	7%
<b>Wigan</b>	1	3%	0	0%	10	20%	29	12%
<b>Outside Greater Manchester (please write in)</b>	5	17%	7	58%	9	18%	86	35%
<b>Base</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>244</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Vehicles owned with a proposed daily charge of £10 or below to enter or travel in the Clean Air Zone**

	Minibus		Van/LGV		Private Hire Vehicle		Hackney Carriage	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<b>Bolton</b>	3	15%	36	9%	44	24%	0	0%
<b>Bury</b>	2	10%	23	6%	5	3%	7	4%
<b>Manchester</b>	3	15%	50	12%	39	21%	30	19%
<b>Oldham</b>	0	0%	27	7%	13	7%	48	30%
<b>Rochdale</b>	1	5%	12	3%	29	16%	8	5%
<b>Salford</b>	2	10%	26	6%	13	7%	4	3%
<b>Stockport</b>	2	10%	47	12%	8	4%	22	14%
<b>Tameside</b>	2	10%	47	12%	9	5%	12	8%
<b>Trafford</b>	1	5%	25	6%	4	2%	12	8%
<b>Wigan</b>	3	15%	55	14%	13	7%	15	9%
<b>Outside Greater Manchester</b>	1	5%	57	14%	7	4%	2	1%
<b>Base</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>405</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Appendix C Questionnaire



# Clean Air Greater Manchester

## The Greater Manchester proposals for the Clean Air Plan

Bolton | Bury | Manchester | Oldham | Rochdale | Salford | Stockport | Tameside | Trafford | Wigan

Instructions on completing the questionnaire

It should take anywhere from 10 to 30 minutes depending on your answers. The last day that you can respond is **Thursday 3 December 2020**.

If you have any concerns or questions about the questionnaire please email [info@cleanairgm.com](mailto:info@cleanairgm.com) or call on **0161 244 1100**.

Throughout this questionnaire, when Greater Manchester or GM is used to describe the decision-making body for the proposals, it refers to the 10 Local Authorities of Greater Manchester.

**Please use a black or blue pen to complete the questionnaire.**

When writing comments, it is preferable if you use capitals to make sure we can clearly read your response. If at any time you run out of space in a section please go to the end of the questionnaire and continue to write on the additional pages provided. Please include the question number on this additional page to ensure we can clearly match your response to the question.

You will note that there are question numbers attached to each question and these may not run in sequential order, this is due to this being part of a larger questionnaire and to save paper we have removed sections and questions which are not relevant to you.

Alongside this, there will still be certain questions which will not be applicable for you, depending on your previous answers and your own circumstances. Where this is the case there is a comment in **CAPITALS** above the question to state who should answer the question, based on the answers provided.

When you reach a question which is not applicable to you then please move to the next page and continue to do so until you see a comment in capitals which states:

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

All responses will go to AECOM – the independent agency who are managing and analysing the responses.

Please post your completed questionnaire to: Freepost RUBS-XRAT-GLBK, AECOM, 1 New York Street, Manchester, M1 4HD. You do not need a stamp.

If you have any supporting documents that you'd like to submit you can include these when posting the questionnaire.

At the end of this document please tick the box to advise that you've submitted extra documents and note the titles of these documents.

Thank you for providing responses for this consultation.

1

### Background

Government is working with more than 60 local authorities across the UK to improve air quality. Greater Manchester has received a direction from Government to introduce a Clean Air Plan to bring nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) levels within legal limits in "the shortest possible time and by 2024 at the latest".

As air pollution does not respect geographic boundaries, the ten Greater Manchester (GM) local authorities (Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Stockport, Trafford, Tameside and Wigan) have come together to produce a joint plan. This co-ordinated approach is seen as the most effective way to deal with a problem that affects all parts of Greater Manchester and will not be remedied on a site-by-site or district-by-district basis. The Clean Air Plan is being co-ordinated by Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM).

The core aim of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan is to remove ALL roadside concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> that have been forecast to exceed the legal limits in the shortest possible time in line with Government guidance. Greater Manchester expects that once the Clean Air Plan has been implemented, by 2024 roadside NO<sub>2</sub> limits will have been met across Greater Manchester.

### What can you have a say on?

Some elements of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan proposals are requirements which have been legally instructed by Government as a result of a Ministerial Direction, (following proposals submitted by GM). These elements are not open to change, and so we are not seeking feedback on these through the consultation. The elements that are fixed include:

- The requirement for a Category C Clean Air Zone
- The type of vehicles which should pay a charge
- The timing of the implementation of the Clean Air Zone in Greater Manchester

### However, we do want your views on the following:

- Elements of the Clean Air Zone such as the details of the proposed boundary, the proposed operation and the proposed daily charge, discounts and exemptions
- Supporting measures such as the funds and vehicle finance available to support impacted vehicles
- The impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic on the ability of businesses / organisations to respond to the proposals

### Who can take part?

We want as many views as possible on this important consultation. Anyone who lives in the UK who is interested in or affected by the proposals should get involved to share their views.

### Where can I find more information?

Before answering any of the consultation questions, please read the consultation document which can be found at [cleanairgm.com](http://cleanairgm.com). You will also find supporting documents to give you more detailed, technical information on the proposals.

The consultation is open until **23:59 on Thursday 3 December 2020**.

If you have any questions or concerns about the questionnaire, please email [info@cleanairgm.com](mailto:info@cleanairgm.com) or call **0161 244 1100**.

*For support to respond to this consultation or to request copies of the consultation document and questionnaire please contact [info@cleanairgm.com](mailto:info@cleanairgm.com) or 0161 244 1100. Support for non-English speakers is available on 0161 244 1100.*

### Confidentiality and data protection

TfGM has commissioned the independent research organisation AECOM to receive and analyse responses to the consultation, and to prepare a report of the findings. Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM) are the data controller and are delivering this consultation for the 10 Greater Manchester Local Authorities under delegated authority. Both TfGM and AECOM will process your personal data in accordance with the Data Protection Act (DPA) 2018, and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).

Information you provide including personal information in response to the consultation will only be published in aggregate form or anonymised. However, if you are responding to the consultation in an official capacity, we may attribute comments you make to the organisation or body you represent. It should be noted that information provided in response to this consultation, including personal information, may be subject to disclosure in accordance with the access to information regimes. These are primarily the Freedom of Information Act 2000 (FOIA), the Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) 2004, the Data Protection Act (DPA) 2018, and the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). Therefore, if we receive a request for disclosure of the information, we cannot give an assurance that confidentiality can be maintained in all circumstances.

Further details of how TfGM process your personal data provided during the consultation and for details of how you can exercise your rights are available at [tfgm.com/privacy-policy](https://www.tfgm.com/privacy-policy) or by emailing [data.protection@tfgm.com](mailto:data.protection@tfgm.com). For AECOM's privacy policy, please visit [aecom.com/privacy-policy](https://www.aecom.com/privacy-policy) or email [privacyquestions@aecom.com](mailto:privacyquestions@aecom.com).

If you no longer wish for us to use your personal information during the analysis stage, you have a right to have the relevant information deleted. Please email [privacyquestions@aecom.com](mailto:privacyquestions@aecom.com) before the consultation ends at 23:59 on Thursday 3 December 2020.

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Opening questions**

**Q01. Are you responding to this consultation as a...?**

*Please tick one only*

- Member of the public
- Business (including self-employed and sole traders)
- Hackney / Private Hire Vehicle - driver / operator
- Organisation (e.g. schools, charities, social enterprise, trade organisations, government bodies)
- Councillor / elected official

**ONLY ANSWER IF YOU ARE RESPONDING ON BEHALF OF A BUSINESS, ORGANISATION, CHARITY OR A PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE OPERATOR**

**Q02. Please provide the name of the organisation.**

*Please write in your response below*

**Q03. Are you authorised to respond on behalf of this organisation?**

*Please tick one only*

- Yes
- No

**ONLY ANSWER IF YOU ARE RESPONDING AS A COUNCILLOR OR ELECTED OFFICIAL**

**Q04. Please provide the following details:**

The area you are elected to represent.

Your name.

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q05. Before this consultation, were you aware of the legal requirement placed on Greater Manchester from Government to introduce plans to tackle air pollution and to introduce a Category C charging Clean Air Zone?**

*Please tick one only*

- Yes
- No

**Q06. Do you currently own / lease or drive any of the following vehicles?**

*Please tick all that apply*

- Bus
- Coach
- Minibus (not licensed as private hire vehicle)
- HGV leisure vehicle (e.g. horsebox >3.5t)
- Van / Light goods vehicle (LGV)
- Heavy goods vehicle (HGV)
- Private hire vehicle
- Hackney carriage
- Private car / motorbike / moped
- Other (please specify):

- No

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q07. Under the current proposals would you have to pay a charge for your vehicle(s) to travel in the Clean Air Zone?**

You can check whether you would be likely to pay a daily charge to enter or travel within the Clean Air Zone at [cleanairgm.com/vehicle-checker](http://cleanairgm.com/vehicle-checker).

Please tick one answer for each vehicle

	Yes	No	Don't know	Not applicable/ I don't have a vehicle
Bus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coach	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minibus (not licensed as private hire vehicle)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HGV leisure vehicle (e.g. horsebox >3.5t)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Van / Light goods vehicle (LGV)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heavy goods vehicle (HGV)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private Hire Vehicle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hackney Carriage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private car/motorbike / moped	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please write the vehicle type in this box)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="text"/>				

**NOTE:** Private cars, motorbikes and mopeds would not be charged to travel in the Clean Air Zone

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q08. If you have a vehicle but won't have to pay the charge - please state why not.**

*Please tick one answer for each vehicle where you've stated "no" in the last question*

	Don't travel in the Clean Air Zone	Vehicle(s) will be compliant	Vehicle(s) will be exempt	Don't know	Other reasons
Bus	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coach	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minibus (not licensed as private hire vehicle)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HGV leisure vehicle (e.g. horsebox >3.5t)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Van / Light goods vehicle (LGV)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Heavy goods vehicle (HGV)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private Hire Vehicle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hackney Carriage	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private car/motorbike/moped	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please write the vehicle type in this box)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="text"/>					

**NOTE:** Private cars, motorbikes and mopeds would not be charged to travel in the Clean Air Zone



**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Clean Air Zone**

For more information to support you in answering these questions, please visit [cleanaigm.com](https://cleanaigm.com) and read section 4.1 (Clean Air Zone at a glance) in the consultation document.

**Q1. The proposed Clean Air Zone boundary would follow the existing administrative boundary of Greater Manchester as closely as possible. Do you have any comments on this?**

You can see a more detailed map which can zoom to a specific location here:  
<https://cleanaigm.com/clean-air-zone-map>

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*






**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q2. The Clean Air Zone would operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, signage would be used to clearly identify the Clean Air Zone, and the daily charges would apply from midnight to midnight. Do you have any comments on these proposals?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*



**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q3. Please tell us what you think of the proposed daily charges for each of the vehicles?**

**(The charge would only apply to vehicles used within the Clean Air Zone which do not meet the emissions standards).**

*Please tick one answer for each vehicle*

	Too much	About right	Too little	Don't know
Buses - £60	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coaches - £60	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HGV - £60	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Vans - £10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Minibuses - £10	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hackney Carriages - £7.50	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Private Hire Vehicles - £7.50	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q3a. Do you have any comments on the proposed charges?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Exemptions and Discounts proposed by Greater Manchester**

For more information to support you in answering these questions, please visit [cleanairgm.com](http://cleanairgm.com) and read section 4.4 (Discounts and Exemptions) in the consultation document.

**Permanent Local Exemptions**

Greater Manchester are proposing permanent local exemptions for Clean Air Zone charges for specialist vehicles, vehicles entering Greater Manchester due to a road diversion on the motorway network and vehicles used for the purposes of a disabled person which are exempt from vehicle tax.

**Q4. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the permanent local exemptions proposed by Greater Manchester?**

*Please tick one only*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree             | <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly agree             | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly disagree          |  |

**Q4a. Why do you say this?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Temporary Local Exemptions**

Greater Manchester are proposing temporary local exemptions from Clean Air Zone charges until **31 December 2022** to give certain vehicles more time to upgrade due to cost / supply of a compliant vehicle and to lessen impacts considered outside of the control of the vehicle owner, these include wheelchair accessible hackney carriage / private hire vehicles, and vans.

**Q5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the temporary local exemptions proposed by Greater Manchester?**

*Please tick one only*

<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree
<input type="checkbox"/> Slightly agree	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable
<input type="checkbox"/> Slightly disagree	

**Q5a. Why do you say this?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Permanent Local Discounts**

Greater Manchester are proposing permanent local discounts for Clean Air Zone charges for private hire vehicles licensed to one of the 10 Greater Manchester Local Authorities and also used as a private car and leisure vehicles greater than 3.5 tonnes in private ownership.

**Q6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the permanent local discounts proposed by Greater Manchester?**

*Please tick one only*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree             | <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly agree             | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly disagree          |  |

**Q6a. Why do you say this?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Funding for the upgrade of non-compliant vehicles registered in Greater Manchester**


For more information to support you in answering these questions, please visit [cleanairm.com](http://cleanairm.com) and read section 5 (Funding to upgrade to compliant vehicles) in the consultation document.

**Funding to support bus operators**

Greater Manchester are proposing financial support to help operators who are registered in Greater Manchester and run a registered bus service in Greater Manchester.

**Q7. Do you have any comments on the proposed Clean Bus Fund (e.g. eligibility criteria, funding amounts)?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*



**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

You could be eligible for this fund if you are registered in Greater Manchester, run a registered bus service and have a vehicle(s) which is not compliant with the Clean Air Zone.

**Q7a. Do you believe you are eligible to access this fund?**

*Please tick one only*

Yes

Don't know

No

Not applicable

**IF YOU HAVE SAID YES, YOU BELIEVE YOU ARE ELIGIBLE**

**Q7b. Would the proposed fund meet your needs e.g. support you to upgrade your vehicle(s)?**

*Please tick one only*

Yes

Don't know

No

**IF YOU HAVE SAID NO, OR YOU DON'T KNOW IF, THE FUND WOULD NOT MEET YOUR NEEDS**


**Q7bb. Why do you say this?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q7c. Do you have any comments about the proposed management of the funds (e.g. if over-subscribed the oldest vehicles could be targeted first)?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*






**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Funding to support coaches, minibuses, HGVs or vans**

Greater Manchester are proposing financial support to help smaller local businesses, sole traders and the Voluntary, Community and Social Enterprise (VCSE) organisations upgrade vans and HGVs, minibuses and coaches, to cleaner compliant vehicles.

**Q8. Do you have any comments on the proposed Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund (e.g. eligibility criteria, funding amounts)?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*



**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Funding to support coaches, minibuses, HGVs or vans**

You could be eligible for this fund if you are a smaller local business, sole trader or a VCSE organisation registered to an address within Greater Manchester for no less than 12 months prior to the date of application and have a vehicle(s) which is not compliant with the Clean Air Zone.

**Q8a. Do you believe you are eligible to access this fund?**

*Please tick one only*

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable

**IF YOU HAVE SAID YES, YOU BELIEVE YOU ARE ELIGIBLE**

**Q8b. Would the proposed fund meet your needs e.g. support you to upgrade your vehicle(s)?**

*Please tick one only*

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> No	

**IF YOU HAVE SAID NO, OR YOU DON'T KNOW IF, THE FUND WOULD NOT MEET YOUR NEEDS**


**Q8bb. Why do you say this?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q8c. Do you have any comments about the proposed management of the funds (e.g. financial support could be available for the smallest businesses first)?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*



**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Funding to support taxis (hackney carriages and private hire vehicles)**

Greater Manchester are proposing financial support to help upgrade hackney carriages / private hire vehicles licensed to one of the 10 Greater Manchester Local Authorities to cleaner compliant vehicles.

**Q9a. Do you have any comments on the proposed funds for hackney carriages (e.g. eligibility criteria, funding amounts)?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*


**Q9b. Do you have any comments on the proposed funds for private hire vehicles (e.g. eligibility criteria, funding amounts)?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q9c. Do you have any comments on the 'try before you buy' initiative?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*



**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

You could be eligible for these funds if you are trading and operating as a licensed hackney carriage or private hire driver or operator with one of the 10 Local Authorities in Greater Manchester for no less than 12 months and have a vehicle(s) which is not compliant with the Clean Air Zone.

**Q9d. Do you believe you are eligible to access either of these funds?**

*Please tick one only*

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable

**IF YOU HAVE SAID YES, YOU BELIEVE YOU ARE ELIGIBLE**

**Q9e. Would the proposed funds / 'try before you buy' meet your needs e.g. support you to upgrade your vehicle(s)?**

*Please tick one only*

<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> Don't know
<input type="checkbox"/> No	

**IF YOU HAVE SAID NO, OR YOU DON'T KNOW IF, THE FUNDS WOULD NOT MEET YOUR NEEDS**


**Q9ee. Why do you say this?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q9f. Do you have any comments about the proposed management of funds (e.g. offered on a first-come-first-served basis once an applicant has evidenced that the eligibility criteria are met)?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*



**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Vehicle Finance Offer**

A Greater Manchester appointed panel of finance providers will work alongside the Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund and Clean Taxi Fund to offer eligible owners of a non-compliant vehicle the option of either a lump sum grant or a finance contribution towards vehicle finance to help them upgrade to a compliant vehicle.

**Q10a. Do you have any comments on the proposed Vehicle Finance Offer?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*



**ANSWER IF YOU BELIEVE YOU ARE ELIGIBLE FOR CLEAN COMMERCIAL OR CLEAN TAXI FUNDINGS**

You would be able to access vehicle finance if you are offered Clean Commercial Vehicle Funding or Clean Taxi Funding, at this time you would be given the option of either a lump sum grant or a finance contribution towards vehicle finance for upgrade to a compliant vehicle.

**Q10b. To what extent do you agree or disagree that the proposed vehicle finance offer would meet your needs e.g. support you to upgrade your vehicle(s)?**

*Please tick one only*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree             | <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly disagree          | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly disagree          |  |

**Q10c. Why do you say this?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Hardship Fund**

Greater Manchester are proposing a Hardship Fund of at least £10m to support individuals, companies and organisations who are assessed to be most economically vulnerable to the Clean Air Zone daily charges. The scope and scale of support required will be considered in light of the impact of COVID-19 and the responses to this questionnaire.

**Q11a. Do you support a hardship fund?**

*Please tick one only*

Yes  Don't know

No


**Q11aa. Please explain why.**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q11b. If you are impacted by the proposed clean air zone daily charges, is there any additional support that you would need?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*



**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Overall impact**

**Q12. To what extent do you agree or disagree that air quality needs to be improved in Greater Manchester?**

*Please tick one only*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly agree             | <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly disagree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Slightly disagree          | <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly disagree |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither agree nor disagree | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know        |

**Q13. Having read through the proposals, how confident are you that the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan would bring roadside nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) levels within legal limits in the shortest possible time?**

*Please tick one only*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Very confident     | <input type="checkbox"/> Very unconfident  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fairly confident   | <input type="checkbox"/> Don't know        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Neither            | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fairly unconfident |  |


**Q13a. Do you have any other comments on the proposals for the Clean Air Plan as set out in the consultation document?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q14. Taking into account both the Clean Air Zone and the support offered, what would be the likely impact on you / your business / your organisation?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*



**PLEASE ANSWER IF YOU ARE RESPONDING**

- **ON BEHALF OF A BUSINESS**
- **AS A TAXI OR PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE DRIVER OR OPERATOR**
- **ON BEHALF OF AN ORGANISATION**

**COVID-19**

Greater Manchester is aware that businesses have been, and continue to be, impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

To understand the impact on you and your business / organisation please answer the following questions.

**Q15a. Which of the following best reflects your trading status as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?**

*Please tick all that apply*

- Have continued trading throughout
- Currently trading, having temporarily paused - but have resumed trading during the pandemic
- Paused trading
- Permanently ceased trading
- Other, please state

**Q15b. Have you or your business received any of the following as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic?**

*Please tick all that apply*

- Coronavirus job retention scheme (aka Furlough)
- Government-backed accredited loans or finance agreements (aka CBIL / BBLs)
- Business grants funded by the UK and devolved governments
- Self-employment income support scheme
- Other government support
- Other loans / grants (please specify)

- Not applied for any of these schemes

**PLEASE ANSWER IF YOU ARE RESPONDING:**

- ON BEHALF OF A BUSINESS
- AS A TAXI OR PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE DRIVER OR OPERATOR
- ON BEHALF OF AN ORGANISATION

**Q15c. To what extent has the COVID-19 pandemic affected the following aspects of your business?**

*Please tick one answer for each vehicle*

	A lot less than before	Less than before	Same as before	More than before	A lot more than before	Not applicable	Don't know	Prefer not to say
Level of debt	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Reserves / Savings	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Turnover	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Profitability	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Q15d. Please use this space to tell us about how the COVID-19 pandemic has affected your ability to meet the proposals outlined within the consultation document:**


*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**ANSWER IF YOU ARE RESPONDING AS A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC OR A COUNCILLOR / ELECTED OFFICIAL**

Greater Manchester is aware that people and businesses have been, and continue to be, impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic.

**Q15dd. Do you have any comments on the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the proposals outlined within the consultation document?**

*Please write in your response below, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*





**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Equality Impact Assessment**

**Q16. A draft Equality Impact Assessment has been produced to identify the potential impacts of the Clean Air Plan proposals on persons with protected characteristics. This can be found at [cleanairm.com](http://cleanairm.com).**

*Please use this space to provide any comments on the draft Equality Impact Assessment, additional space is provided at the end of the questionnaire, if needed*

**PLEASE ANSWER IF YOU ARE A HACKNEY CARRIAGE OR PRIVATE HIRE VEHICLE OWNER/DRIVER/ OPERATOR**

**Q09. Are you a...**

*Please tick all that apply*

- Licensed hackney carriage driver – own vehicle
- Licensed hackney carriage driver– rent a licensed vehicle that is kept at my home address
- Licensed hackney carriage driver– rent a licensed vehicle that is not kept at my home address
- Licensed private hire driver – own vehicle
- Licensed private hire driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is kept at my home address
- Licensed private hire driver – rent a licensed vehicle that is not kept at my home address
- Private hire operator

**PLEASE ANSWER IF YOU ARE RESPONDING AS A BUSINESS OR ORGANISATION**

**About you / your organisation**

**Q010. Where is your business, charity or organisation registered?**

*Please tick all that apply*

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bolton                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Tameside   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bury   | <input type="checkbox"/> Trafford   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oldham                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Manchester |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rochdale                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Salford    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Stockport                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Wigan      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Outside Greater Manchester (please write in) | <input type="text"/>                |

**PLEASE ANSWER IF YOU ARE RESPONDING AS A BUSINESS**

**Q011. What sector does your business fall into?**

*Please tick one only*

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture, forestry & fishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Information & communication                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mining, quarrying & utilities   | <input type="checkbox"/> Financial & insurance                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Manufacturing                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Property                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Construction                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Professional, scientific & technical       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Motor trades                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Business administration & support services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Wholesale                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Public administration & defence            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Retail                          | <input type="checkbox"/> Education                                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Transport & storage             | <input type="checkbox"/> Health                                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Accommodation & food services   | <input type="checkbox"/> Arts, entertainment, recreation & other    |

**Q012. What is the size of your business?**

*Please tick one only*

- Sole trader / self-employed (1 person)
- Micro business (2-9 employees)
- Small business (10-49 employees)
- Medium business (50-249 employees)
- Large business (250+ employees)

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q013. Where do you live?**

*Please tick all that apply*

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bolton                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Tameside   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bury   | <input type="checkbox"/> Trafford   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oldham                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Manchester |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rochdale                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Salford    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Stockport                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Wigan      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Outside Greater Manchester (please write in) |                                     |

**Q.014. Postcode**

What is your home postcode?

What is your registered business postcode?

**PLEASE ANSWER IF YOU ARE RESPONDING AS A HACKNEY OR PRIVATE HIRE DRIVER OR OPERATOR**

**Q015. Which district are you licensed with?**

*Please tick all that apply*

- |   |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bolton                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Tameside   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bury   | <input type="checkbox"/> Trafford   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Oldham                                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Manchester |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Rochdale                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Salford    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Stockport                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Wigan      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Outside Greater Manchester (please write in) |                                     |

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

We must consider how different people will be affected by our strategies and policies, and we also want to make sure we hear from people from all of Greater Manchester's diverse backgrounds. Therefore the last few questions are about you, to help us ensure we hear from a range of voices, and to help identify any possible discrimination or barriers for particular groups of people. The personal information you give us will remain strictly confidential and we will not use it in a way that could identify you.

If there are questions you would prefer not to answer please choose the 'prefer not to say' option.

**Q016. How old are you?**

*Please tick one only*

<input type="checkbox"/> Under 13	<input type="checkbox"/> 45-54
<input type="checkbox"/> 13-17	<input type="checkbox"/> 55-64
<input type="checkbox"/> 18-24	<input type="checkbox"/> 65-74
<input type="checkbox"/> 25-34	<input type="checkbox"/> 75+
<input type="checkbox"/> 35-44	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say

**Q017. What is your ethnic group?**

*Please tick one only*

<input type="checkbox"/> Asian or Asian British - Indian	<input type="checkbox"/> Mixed - White and Black African
<input type="checkbox"/> Asian or Asian British - Pakistan	<input type="checkbox"/> Mixed - White and Asian
<input type="checkbox"/> Asian or Asian British - Bangladesh	<input type="checkbox"/> Mixed - Any other mixed background
<input type="checkbox"/> Asian or Asian British - Chinese	<input type="checkbox"/> White - English/Welsh/Scottish/ Northern Irish/British
<input type="checkbox"/> Asian or Asian British - Kashmiri	<input type="checkbox"/> White - Irish
<input type="checkbox"/> Asian or Asian British - Any other Asian background	<input type="checkbox"/> White - Gypsy or Irish Traveller
<input type="checkbox"/> Black or Black British - Caribbean	<input type="checkbox"/> White - Eastern European
<input type="checkbox"/> Black or Black British - African	<input type="checkbox"/> White - Any other White background
<input type="checkbox"/> Black or Black British - Any other Black background	<input type="checkbox"/> Other ethnic group - Arab
<input type="checkbox"/> Mixed - White and Black Caribbean	<input type="checkbox"/> Other ethnic group - Other
	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say

**Q018. What is your religion?**

*Please tick one only*

<input type="checkbox"/> Buddhist	<input type="checkbox"/> Sikh
<input type="checkbox"/> Christian	<input type="checkbox"/> Other religion
<input type="checkbox"/> Hindu	<input type="checkbox"/> No religion
<input type="checkbox"/> Jewish	<input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say
<input type="checkbox"/> Muslim	

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q019. How do you describe your gender?**

*Please tick one only*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> A man (including Trans Man)     | <input type="checkbox"/> In another way    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> A woman (including Trans Women) | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Non-binary                      |  |

**Q020. Do you identify as trans/transgender?**

*Please tick one only*

- |                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> In some ways      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No  | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say |

**Q021. Which of the following best describes how you think of yourself?**

*Please tick one only*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bisexual             | <input type="checkbox"/> Other sexual orientation<br>(please write in below) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gay man              | <input type="text"/>   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Gay woman or lesbian |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Heterosexual         | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say                                   |

**Q022. Are your day-to-day activities limited because of a health problem or disability?**

*Please tick one only*

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, limited a lot    | <input type="checkbox"/> No                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, limited a little | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say |

**Q023. Could you please tell me which of the conditions best describe your health issues or disability?**

*Please tick all that apply*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Learning disability                | <input type="checkbox"/> Sensory disability |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mental ill health                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mobility disability                |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other disability (please write in) |   |

**Q024. Are you more vulnerable to air pollution for health reasons (e.g. pregnant or suffer from asthma or a heart condition)?**

*Please tick one only*

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - it affects me a lot    | <input type="checkbox"/> No                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Yes - it affects me a little | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say |

**EVERYONE CAN ANSWER THESE QUESTIONS**

**Q025. How did you hear about this consultation?**

*Please tick one only*

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Email  | <input type="checkbox"/> Radio                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Twitter                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Local newspaper                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Facebook                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Events                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Instagram                                    | <input type="checkbox"/> cleanairgm.com website               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> LinkedIn                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Website (not cleanairgm.com website) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Posters                                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Word of mouth                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Search engine advert                         | <input type="checkbox"/> Prefer not to say                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please write in) <input type="text"/> |   |

**Q026. Please see privacy notice at [tfgm.com/privacy-policy](http://tfgm.com/privacy-policy) to see how your data will be held and your individual rights under GDPR.**

*Please select those that apply in the list below, if...*

- You would like to be kept informed on the development of the Clean Air Plan proposals
- You own / drive an impacted vehicle and would like information about support when it becomes available
- You are willing to take part in further research / consultation activity
- I do not want to provide my contact details

**Q027: Contact**

*Please provide the following details*

Name

Telephone Number

Email address

**NOTE:** If you are aged under 13, we require the contact details from a parent or legal guardian and they must confirm they have given their permission to provide their contact details by ticking below:

- As a parent / guardian of the person responding to this consultation who is aged under 13, I have provided my contact details.

Thank you for sharing your views on the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan proposals.

Once the consultation has closed on **Thursday 3 December 2020**, all the feedback received will be read and considered to help shape the final plan.

Please post your completed questionnaire to the address below. You do not need a stamp.

Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan  
Freepost RUBS-XRAT-GLBK  
AECOM  
1 New York Street  
MANCHESTER  
M1 4HD

**IF YOU HAVE RUN OUT OF SPACE WHEN WRITING A COMMENT, PLEASE COMPLETE YOUR COMMENT HERE:**

Question:

Question:

For support to respond to this consultation or to request copies of the summary document and questionnaire please contact [info@cleanairgm.com](mailto:info@cleanairgm.com) or 0161 244 1100. Support for non-English speakers is available on 0161 244 1100."

Prosimy o kontakt przez email [info@cleanairgm.com](mailto:info@cleanairgm.com) lub telefonicznie pod numerem 0161 244 1100 po pomoc w odpowiedzi na tą konsultację lub aby móc otrzymać egzemplarze dokumentacji z podsumowaniem wraz z ankietą.

Wsparcie dla osób nie mówiących po angielsku można otrzymać pod numerem 0161 244 1100.

এই পরামর্শে সাড়া দিতে সাহায্যের জন্য অথবা সামারি ডকুমেন্ট অর্থাৎ সারসর্ম এবং প্রশ্নমালার কপি পেতে ইমেইলে যোগাযোগ করুন - [info@cleanairgm.com](mailto:info@cleanairgm.com)  
অথবা, এই নাম্বারে ফোন করুন- 0161 244 1100  
যারা ইংরেজি বলেন না তাদের জন্য সহযোগিতার ব্যবস্থা রয়েছে, সাহায্য পেতে এই নাম্বারে ফোন করুন- 0161 244 1100

اس مشاورت کا جواب دینے میں مدد یا دستاویز کا خلاصہ اور سوالنامہ کی کاپی حاصل کرنے کے کیلئے براہ مہربانی  
[info@cleanairgm.com](mailto:info@cleanairgm.com) یا 0161 244 1100 پر رابطہ کیجئے۔  
جن افراد کو انگریزی بولنے میں مدد درکار ہے وہ 0161 244 1100 پر فون کریں۔

"एस्तावेजना सारांश अने प्रश्नावलिनी नकलो मेळववा माटे अथवा आ परामर्शनी जवाब आपवा माटे  
मदद मेळववा कृपा करीने [info@cleanairgm.com](mailto:info@cleanairgm.com) पर छमेछल द्वारा संपर्क करो  
अथवा तमे 0161 244 1100 पर टेलिफोन करी शके छे.

જ લોકો અંગ્રેજી નથી બોલતા, તેઓ मदद मेळववा, 0161 244 1100 पर टेलिफोन करी शके छे."

"للحصول على الدعم للرد على هذه الاستشارة أو لطلب نسخ من الوثيقة الموجزة والاستبيان، يرجى  
التواصل على البريد الإلكتروني

[info@cleanairgm.com](mailto:info@cleanairgm.com) أو الإتصال بالرقم 0161 244 1100.

يتوفر الدعم لغير الناطقين باللغة الإنجليزية على الرقم 0161 244 1100."



## Appendix D Qualitative Discussions

### Introduction

Poor air quality is the largest environmental risk to human health and whilst air quality has been improving over time, pollutants remain a concern in many urban areas, including Greater Manchester.

Since 2010, the UK has been in breach of the legal limits of levels of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) in major urban areas, with road transport responsible for a significant proportion of roadside concentrations. In response, the Government is working with more than 60 local authorities, including the Greater Manchester districts, across the UK to improve air quality. This includes a specific direction to introduce a Clean Air Plan (CAP) to bring NO<sub>2</sub> levels within legal limits in “the shortest possible time and by 2024 at the latest”.

Eight Greater Manchester authorities were initially identified by the Government as having roads which are expected to continue to exceed the maximum legal limits of NO<sub>2</sub> in 2021. However, local air quality modelling has shown that there are exceedances in all ten authorities and action needs to be taken to address the issue.

The core aim of the Greater Manchester Clean Air Plan (GM CAP) is to remove all roadside concentrations of NO<sub>2</sub> that have been forecast to exceed the legal limits in the shortest possible time in line with Government guidance. Greater Manchester expects once the CAP has been implemented, by 2024, roadside NO<sub>2</sub> limits will have been met across Greater Manchester.

The GM CAP consultation was held between Thursday 8<sup>th</sup> October and Thursday 3<sup>rd</sup> December 2020 for a period of eight weeks. The wider consultation sought views about the proposed Clean Air Zone (CAZ), and funding packages designed to support owners of non-compliant vehicles upgrade. The consultation provided an opportunity for all those with an interest in the proposals to provide feedback.

In order to get a greater depth of understanding of the possible impacts of the proposals, Transport for Greater Manchester (TfGM), on behalf of the 10 Local Authorities of Greater Manchester, commissioned AECOM to manage and moderate a series of qualitative research to run parallel with the main public consultation.

## Research Objectives

Qualitative research was undertaken with groups most likely to be affected by the proposals. This research ran alongside the consultation survey and explored in detail perceptions of the proposals, the impacts of the proposals and thoughts on the proposed funding assistance to mitigate potential impacts. The outputs will complement the formal consultation findings.

The key questions to answer from the qualitative research were:

- Understanding the scale of the air pollution challenge, who or what they believe contributes the most to air pollution in general and how they are, or may be, personally affected by it;
- The response to both the charging and mitigation measures being proposed in the CAP, e.g. types of vehicles affected and unaffected, charges by vehicle type, funding available for these affected vehicles, and interest in taking up packages of support;
- The impacts of each of the measures on them personally and / or their business and / or economic opportunities;
- A review of the response to the measures;
- When more information is offered, whether the proposed support is adequate to reduce any adverse economic impacts on them personally and / or their business;
- The impact of Covid-19 on their current travel behaviour; and
- The impact of Covid-19 on their ability to respond to the charging CAZ and the potential scale of funding support available.

## Methodology

Qualitative research offers additional value by giving a voice to the type of respondents who may be impacted by the introduction of a CAZ, whether directly or indirectly. The use of qualitative research enhances understanding of the expected impacts, for example, understanding how people are going to respond to the CAZ requirements.

## Sample Profile

In consultation with the client, the research was split into two groups of individuals and businesses as follows:

### **Twelve focus groups with members of the public**

- Ten groups with residents from across all districts of Greater Manchester.
- Two groups with individuals who live outside the Greater Manchester region, but travel into the region

### **Ten focus groups with businesses who have at least one non-compliant vehicle**

- Seven groups based within the Greater Manchester region.
- Three groups based outside the region but undertake work or travel within the region for business purposes.

In addition to the groups, AECOM undertook six depth interviews with businesses who were unable to attend a group setting, to ensure the range of required business types were included.

Greater Manchester has been directed by Government to introduce a charging CAZ Class C across the region. This means owners or registered keepers of the following vehicle types will be required to pay a daily charge for driving into or within the zone. Therefore, we spoke to the following people:

- Licensed hackney carriages;
- Licensed private hire vehicles (PHVs);
- Buses;
- Coaches;
- Minibuses;
- Light Goods Vehicles (LGVs), such as vans; and
- Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs).

The charge is applicable unless the vehicle is compliant with the vehicle emission standards set out in Government's CAZ Framework.<sup>1</sup>

## Individuals' Profile

A total of 72 individuals took part in the qualitative research about the GM CAP. **Table 3.1** shows the respondents' demographic profile and other key criteria for each group.

<sup>1</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/863730/clean-air-zone-framework-feb2020.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/863730/clean-air-zone-framework-feb2020.pdf)

**Table 3.1: Demographic Profiles of Individuals' Groups**

Location	Type of Respondent	Criteria
<b>Group 1: Outside Greater Manchester, but travel into region</b>	Aged 18-40 Mix of genders	Predominantly bus and taxi users within the Greater Manchester region
<b>Group 2: Outside Greater Manchester, but travel into GM Region</b>	Aged 40+ Mix of genders	Predominantly bus and taxi users within the Greater Manchester region
<b>Group 3: Inside Greater Manchester</b>	Aged 18-40 Mix of genders Mix of Black and Minority Ethnic (BAME) All have young children or families	Mix of modes used within Greater Manchester Live in areas of poor air quality Mix of income levels
<b>Group 4: Inside Greater Manchester</b>	Aged 18-40 Mix of genders Mix of BAME All have young children or families	Mix of modes used within Greater Manchester Mix of income levels
<b>Group 5: Inside Greater Manchester</b>	Any age Mix of genders Mix of disabilities	Taxi and PHV users at least once a fortnight
<b>Group 6: Inside Greater Manchester</b>	Aged 41+ Mix of genders Mix of respondents with respiratory conditions	50% from poor air quality areas and 50% other areas
<b>Group 7: Inside Greater Manchester</b>	Aged 18-45 Mix of genders Mix of respondents with respiratory conditions Young children and families	50% from poor air quality areas and 50% other areas
<b>Group 8: Inside Greater Manchester</b>	Aged 18-34 Mix of genders Mix of BAME respondents	Mix of modes used From poor air quality areas Low income areas
<b>Group 9: Inside Greater Manchester</b>	Aged 35+ Mix of genders Mix of BAME respondents	Mix of modes used From poor air quality areas Low income areas
<b>Group 10: Inside Greater Manchester</b>	Aged 18-34 Female only participants	Bus and taxi / PHV users within Greater Manchester region Low income areas
<b>Group 11: Inside Greater Manchester</b>	Aged 65+ Mix of genders	Bus and taxi users within Greater Manchester region Low income
<b>Group 12: Inside Greater Manchester</b>	Any age Mix of genders	Have non-compliant vehicle e.g. motorcaravan / horsebox
<b>Depth 1*: Outside Greater Manchester, but travel into region</b>	Female	Horsebox owner

\*this respondent could not attend their group due to unforeseen circumstances so was interviewed at a later date

### Businesses Respondents' Profile

A total of 38 business respondents took part in the GM CAP qualitative research and the breakdown can be seen in **Table 3.2**.

**Table 3.2: Business Group Sectors**

Group / Sector	Criteria
<b>Group Business 1 (B1):</b> Agriculture / Construction / Waste management	Outside Greater Manchester, but travel into region
<b>Group Business 2 (B2):</b> Minibus / Coach	
<b>Group Business 3 (B3):</b> Retail	
<b>Group Business 4 (B4):</b> Agriculture / Construction / Waste management	Inside Greater Manchester At least three districts of Greater Manchester represented
<b>Group Business 5 (B5):</b> Night-time economy (food / retail / hospitality)	
<b>Group Business 6 (B6):</b> Retail	
<b>Group Business 7 (B7):</b> Manufacturing / HGV	
<b>Group Business 8 (B8):</b> Company / owners of coach / minibus, including charities (e.g. voluntary sector)	
<b>Group Business 9 (B9):</b> Van owners (construction / retail)	
<b>Group Business 10 (B10):</b> Van owner (mix e.g. mobile gardener / florist / hairdresser)	
<b>Depth 2:</b> Waste management business	Inside Greater Manchester
<b>Depth 3:</b> Manufacturing business	Inside Greater Manchester
<b>Depth 4:</b> Coach / Minibus business	Outside Greater Manchester, but travel into Greater Manchester
<b>Depth 5:</b> Plumbing and Gas business	Inside Greater Manchester
<b>Depth 6:</b> Butchers business	Outside Greater Manchester, but travel into Greater Manchester

## Recruitment

All participants were screened to ensure they met the eligibility criteria for the focus group or depth interview they were being recruited for. Anyone who worked in public transport, for TfGM or the 10 GM Local Authorities was excluded from participating in the research. Participants were told the purpose of the research was to understand their awareness and views of the GM CAP and the impact on them and others.

All groups with individuals and businesses were structured to last up to one hour and 30 minutes to allow comprehensive coverage of the topics. Five participants were recruited for each group and all groups comprised of three to five participants. Owing to the Covid-19 pandemic and constraints on staging traditional face-to-face focus groups in person, the groups were completed virtually (using Microsoft Teams or Zoom). The virtual nature of the groups meant it was considered more practical to have more groups with fewer respondents in a group to ensure the same level of detail and discussion was achieved as would be in a more traditional face-to-face session.

In addition to the groups, six businesses took part in depth interviews using Microsoft Teams, Zoom or by telephone, in which a similar discussion guide to the one used in the focus groups was utilised. The content was tailored to them, their trade and the industry. Interviews were completed one-on-one with an experienced moderator and lasted up to 60 minutes.

## Discussion Guide

The basis of the discussion was a topic guide, which was developed prior to the research being undertaken. This acted as an aide-memoire to the moderator to ensure all topics were covered during the focus groups. A copy of the guides can be found in **Appendix A and Appendix B**. Topics covered included:

- Air quality;
- CAP proposals;
- CAZ;
- Vehicles and exemptions;
- Funding and charging;
- Impact on businesses with affected vehicles;
- Impact on individuals with affected vehicles;
- Impact on individuals without affected vehicles; and
- Impacts of Covid-19.

Each moderator was provided with the following documentation alongside the discussion guide:

- Summary of the key information in the consultation documents e.g. boundary, funding etc. to ensure all respondent have had the same information;
- Consultation document; and
- Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs).

Before the programme of groups and depth interviews began, TfGM and AECOM held a joint briefing session for all moderators to explain the objectives of the research and outline the details and materials needed to undertake moderation of the groups. This ensured consistency across all groups.

## Moderation

The focus groups and depth interviews were moderated by trained and experienced moderators. The moderator stimulated the discussion using their knowledge of the study topic, with the assistance of a discussion guide, a list of FAQs and slides with key information on, taking into consideration the research objectives.

Throughout the discussion, the moderator introduced different topic areas (based on the discussion guide), information on the range of proposals to promote discussion and debate. Participants were encouraged to discuss the issues within the group and not simply respond to a set of questions posed by the moderator. Participants were asked to give reasons for their points of view and respond to others they may or may not agree with.

## Findings

### Air Quality

The first task within the focus groups was to understand respondents' awareness and opinion on air quality, in general, within Greater Manchester. Following this, the focus group sought to understand if there is any impact on the respondents or their business and what respondents' views are on air pollution currently and whether they believe action needs to be taken.

#### Air Quality - Individuals

The consensus amongst members of the public was the level of air quality is generally poor in Greater Manchester and needs to be improved. Many felt there was a noticeable difference between urban areas in GM and more rural areas on the periphery and outside the region.

*"Grim, if you go outside of Manchester, there's a grey cloud that hovers over Manchester. If you go anywhere, I go walking in the Peak District a lot and you can see Manchester and, honestly, there is just a grey cloud over Manchester all the time. It is definitely very badly polluted." (Public, G10, Female only group, Aged 18-34, Bus/ Taxi users, Low income areas, Inside GM)*

However, a handful of respondents had previously lived in other big cities and stated the air quality seemed better in Manchester compared to other cities, such as London.

Some respondents in the groups had respiratory illnesses, such as asthma. Several respondents with asthma said it was noticeable when the level of air quality was poorer, through changes in their breathing.

*"So, I am asthmatic, so once there's a change in, not just smells, like dust, anything, there's just the change and it's not clean, I can tell instantly and even when someone else cannot smell it, my body already tells, I can feel it. So, for that reason, I'm concerned as well about air pollution and so many, actually, health conditions are brought on by air pollution and most people don't know. So yeah, it's very important to me." (Public, G8, Mix of modes used, Live in poor air quality areas, Aged 18-34, Inside GM)*

*"Yeah, the thought process was, I have asthma as well, and I noticed the difference. I used to live closer to town last year, and now I've moved back with my in-laws and it's kind of outside of Stockport, and my asthma got better because of the air quality, you can clearly tell the difference, so I was just nodding to that." (Public, G4, Mix of modes used, Mix of income levels, Aged 18-40, Inside GM)*

When asked who is responsible for improving air quality, this was met with a range of responses. Some respondents stated everyone plays a part in being responsible.

*"I personally think we're responsible. There's only so much the Government can do and I think it's important that we ..., lots of things come down to education and if we educate ourselves on certain things, just on what it is in the first instance and the consequences of it, then we'll know to individually do what we can to help. There's only so much, like I said, they can do. There's so many areas to focus on, so it's like the little bits we all do sums up to a lot." (Public, G8, Mix of modes used, Live in poor air quality areas, Aged 18-34, Inside GM)*

Others felt specific groups or organisations were more responsible than others for improving air quality.

*"I would say maybe it's more the council, though, because they have their facilities to be able to put in initiatives that they want to use, like what sort of fuel the bus has, it's not our responsibility, sort of thing, so I'd say, yeah, everyone does have responsibility, but there's certain people that can facilitate it more." (Public, G10, Female only group, Aged 18-34, Bus/ Taxi users, Low income areas, Inside GM)*



When asked what barriers there are to improving air quality, many respondents referenced general time pressures in their lives as reasons why they chose to travel by car rather than a more sustainable mode.

*"I always book trains home and then don't give myself time to get the bus or whatever, and then I end up getting an Uber instead or something, stuff that you could avoid, but you know." (Public, G10, Female only group, Aged 18-34, Bus/ Taxi users, Low income areas, Inside GM)*

*"I think daily pressures, like everything has to be very instant and quick, so if you have to get somewhere you can't afford to like take your time cycling or this or that, you have to just like be there and you're rushing to take your kids to school or whatever, don't know what everyone else's situation is, things like that." (Public, G10, Female only group, Aged 18-34, Bus/ Taxi users, Low income areas, Inside GM)*

## Air Quality - Businesses

All respondents in the business focus groups were asked what they thought of the current air quality in Greater Manchester, and there was a mixed response to this question across the groups.

Some respondents felt the air quality in Greater Manchester is not as bad as elsewhere, whilst some respondents stated compared to rural areas in and close to Greater Manchester, it is worse within the more urban areas of Greater Manchester.

*"I would have thought it's not good, it's a very congested area, high volume of traffic, so I would have thought the air quality isn't good. Just speaking as a layman, it's an inner city, so yeah, I'm probably stating the obvious there. (Business, Minibus / Coach, B2, Outside GM)*

Most respondents thought the very centre of Greater Manchester (i.e. the Regional Centre) was the worst area for poor air quality and cited peak traffic and congestion as the source for this problem.

*"Well, I would say clean air would be moving further towards the countryside. The further you move towards the trees and the greenery, the cleaner the air is going to be. If you're in a congested area, such as an inner city with peak time traffic, you're not going to get that. How can you produce more clean air within an inner city? I don't know." (Business, HGV / LGV, B1: Agriculture, Construction, Outside GM)*

Many respondents stated air quality and air pollution is a problem, but although they recognise that, it is not necessarily a priority to them or their business.

*"Definitely an important issue, it's got to be up there as an important issue, you know, with climate change and with moving into a market and an industry that's growing year on year and producing more pollution, it has to be something that we've got to talk about. We can't ignore it," (Business, HGV / LGV, B1: Agriculture, Construction, Outside GM)*

*"I recognise that it is an issue, and we try to make sure our vehicles are cleaner than others, but it isn't a priority compared to some issues. Keeping the business afloat just takes priority." (Business, B3: Retail, Outside GM)*

Some businesses felt quite strongly about what causes air pollution and focused on two types of vehicles: cars and HGVs, as the main contributors to poor air quality.

*"I think the problem is the amount of cars on the road. You've only got to see, because at the minute, there's hardly any cars on the road, so we're not stuck in traffic, so we're not causing as much pollution, and my view is the amount of cars on the road. They need to tackle that, because that's the big issue." (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, B8, Inside GM)*

*"Surely the big lorries and vans are contributing to the pollution more than other vehicles?" (Public, G12: Campervan / Horseboxes)*



Some respondents also highlighted other issues, such as air traffic, factories and industries as contributors to poor air quality. A couple of people felt that the priority should just be the more damaging vehicles, not who owns them or who they belong to.

*"Surely if you want the polluting vehicles off the road, surely the priority is you'll be taking the oldest ones off the road first, irrelevant of whether it's a big firm or a small firm operating them." (Business, HGV, B7, Manufacturing / HGV transport, Inside GM)*

Some respondents observed when cars were off the road during the first lockdown the skies were clearer, and less air pollution was evident.

*"I think we should be concerned about it. Just because if you notice when we have to lock down, the first lockdown, everything was locked, cleaner skies were a lot bluer, and there wasn't this heavy polluted sky anymore." (Business, B3: Retail, Outside GM)*

A handful of businesses felt they do have to consider their carbon footprint as part of their business operation, and their clients are also interested in that too, so it is something of relevance within their business. This was mainly amongst HGV vehicle owners and any vehicles registered for the Fleet Operator Recognition Scheme (FORS) program.

*"As a company, we are aware of our carbon footprint. Most of our clients are, they make demands on us regarding that., and they want to know everything we do, the vehicles we use, our carbon footprint etc.". (Business, B3: Retail, Outside GM)*

Whilst some businesses felt everyone has a responsibility for improving air quality, some businesses felt it was the Government's issue rather than theirs.

*"Personally, I would say central Government. The problem, when central Government rolls it all out to the individual authorities, you get a very much scattergun approach with piecemeal plans going on, depending on where you live. I would say the priority should be for the central Government to set one process and apply it to all the regions, but it seems a very much opposite approach that they're taking." (Business, HGV / LGV, B1: Agriculture, Construction, Outside GM)*

## Awareness of the CAP Proposals

The number of respondents in either the individuals or business groups aware of the CAP proposals was low. As a result, many respondents did not initially understand how they could be impacted by the CAP proposals.

## Awareness of the CAP - Individuals

A lot of the individuals were surprised by the news of these proposals and were taken aback by who would be liable to pay a charge. Many felt the general public was part of the problem too.

*"I think it's strange because there's so many more people, there's so many more cars and HGVs and vans for driving into town, and I thought you're meant to be encouraging the people, not just the businesses. It feels like you're targeting just businesses, rather than individuals, and I think it's the individuals that need to actually do the groundwork, and we all need to contribute. It's not really going to have any effect on people, really." (Public, G3: Aged 18-40, All with young families and children, Mix of modes used, Live in poor air quality areas, Inside GM)*

*"I'm surprised that it's so far on and I've heard nothing about it, like when I got the thing that said compliant vehicles, I didn't even know what one of them was. But I think there'll be a lot of people who will suddenly find this thrust on them and they'll think where's this come from and I don't think it's been publicised very well." (Public, G14: Campervan / Horsebox)*

The term 'Clean Air' was not completely unfamiliar to many across the groups, but when pushed on detail or any sort of explanation as to what the proposals could involve, many did not know or could not tell the moderator any further detail.

*“Something to do with bringing in restrictions and about the clean zones or something right?” (Public, G8, Mix of modes used, Live in poor air quality areas, Aged 18-34, Inside GM)*

Some individuals felt this was a positive step, but it wasn't potentially going far enough.

*“It's definitely a step in the right direction, but if private cars aren't charged and then maybe prices go up, I don't see how it would limit peoples travel or impact it.” (Public, G10, Female only group, Aged 18-34, Bus / Taxi users, Low income areas, Inside GM)*

*“I think because private vehicles aren't banned and stuff like that or are not going to be charged, I don't think there'll be a positive. There'll probably be a slight positive effect, but some people will have to give up their vehicles, because they can't do that type of work anymore or whatever, it'll have to change. I think there'll be some effect, but I don't think it'll be the massive effect that they expect, or they hope.” (Public, G3, Aged 18-40, All with young families or children, Live in poor air quality areas, Inside GM)*

*“In my opinion I don't think it'll change anything, as long as you're allowing private cars in and stuff I don't think it'll change anything.” (Public, G3: Aged 18-40, Mix modes used, Poor air quality areas, low income, Inside GM)*

Due to the lack of knowledge on the proposals, some respondents made assumptions about what they thought the proposals referred to:

*“Yes, I was aware of it, but I thought it was more like a congestion charge than a Clean Air Plan. But I think I read something about it in an Uber, actually. I was taking an Uber into Manchester, and I think there was like a small laminated card in the back of the taxi, because obviously taxis are all massively affected by this.” (Public, G12: Campervan / Horseboxes)*

*“Yes, I think in principle that it's a really good idea, because it is tackling the issue head on. It's really hard to know how it would work in practice, but I think the principle behind it was really good.” (Public, G8, Mix of modes used, Live in poor air quality areas, Aged 18-34, Inside GM)*

Some individuals hoped businesses knew more about the proposals than they did, because they were going to need time and economic investment to meet the proposals. They felt increasing awareness of the proposals is the first step.

*“When was this proposal made? Because I'm just thinking for businesses to be able to react to this, it's just the financial impact and the operational impact it may have, so it just depends how quick you've got to react, because you'd be gutted if you bought a new fleet of vehicles last year, and then like in eighteen months' time, we'd have to change them all again. (Public, G4, Mix of modes used, Mix of income levels, Aged 18-40, Inside GM)*

## Awareness of the CAP - Businesses

The awareness of the proposals amongst business respondents was mixed. A small number had knowledge of the proposals and its details, whilst slightly more were aware of the proposals but did not know much of the detail. There were several businesses across the groups who were not aware the introduction of the CAZ is imminent.

For some of the businesses, their initial reaction was they would “park” some vehicles or use only compliant vehicles for work within the region.

*“Yeah, HGVs, yeah. We would have upgraded some this year, but with the current situation, we've put purchases on hold and until, you know, we know what's in front of us, we're not going to go out and replace all those vehicles, you know. If it's quiet in the new year, we'll look at parking some up, rather than replace them.” (Business, HGV, B7, Manufacturing / HGV transport, Inside GM)*

Some respondents felt the CAP was being brought in as a replacement to the congestion charge and felt it is only a matter of time before privately owned cars are included in the charges.

*“Is this just the charge they tried to bring in a few years ago? Is it just a congestion charge under another name?” (Business, LGV, B5, Night-time economy, Inside GM)*

Some businesses had some awareness of the plans but did not realise the extent of scale of the proposals.

*“I thought it would be for the sort of like inside the M60, I didn’t realise it was the whole of the Greater Manchester area.” (Business, HGV / LGV, B1: Agriculture, Construction, Outside GM)*

Some businesses felt others were unaware of these proposals and were concerned as they could significantly affect some people’s livelihoods.

*“The fact that there’s people out there that have commercial vehicles and they don’t have a clue what’s going on? The impact that this could make on a company, people’s jobs, it’s their livelihoods at the end of the day and with what’s going on at the minute [Covid-19], I think they need to have a look at timing.” (Business, HGV, B7, Manufacturing / HGV transport, Inside GM)*

## Clean Air Zone (CAZ)

As set out in the consultation document, a major component of the CAP proposals is the introduction of a Greater Manchester wide CAZ, which is a designated area whereby certain higher pollution vehicles would pay a charge to drive in. Vehicles which do not comply with the required emissions standards would pay a daily charge for each day they drive into, out of, within or through the zone.

Within these proposals, the CAZ is scheduled to launch in Spring 2022 and will operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Vehicles to be charged if they are not of the required emissions level include buses, vans, HGVs, hackney carriage and PHVs. It should be noted private cars are not included in the Greater Manchester scheme.

## Impact of the CAZ - Individuals

Some individuals struggled to initially understand how the CAZ would impact them. Through discussion in the groups, some respondents felt it could have an indirect impact on them through charges being placed elsewhere.

*“But what I’m thinking is, if public transport does get more expensive and private cars are not charged, that means it might backfire. Obviously, I don’t know too much about it, because then people like myself will be more likely to try and get a car, rather than carry on using public transport. So, then there’ll be a lot of emissions from the private cars, it might increase more, because as public transport gets more expensive, it’ll definitely put people off.” (Public, G10, Female only group, Aged 18-34, Bus / Taxi users, Low income areas, Inside GM)*

*“I feel it’s not going to have a very great impact, to be honest, because it’s not charging private cars. It’s only, you know, buses, vans, taxis, that kind of thing. I think, you know, it’s not going to have a massive impact, because what they’ll pay in the charge will be passed on to their customer. So, I don’t think it’s going to reduce any vehicle usage that I can see. I think we’re going to have the same amount of usage. I think it’ll just end up being more expensive for the customer.” (Public, G2: Aged 40+, Bus / Taxi users within region, Outside GM)*

*“I definitely agree it would be better to have cleaner air, and that’s something I would be happier about, but I would be interested to know, for someone like me, how is the clean air charge going to affect the price of my bus ticket, like is that going to be swallowed up or, probably, they’ll just pass it on to us.” (Public, G8, Mix of modes used, Live in poor air quality areas, Aged 18-34, Inside GM)*

## Impact of the CAZ - Businesses

The response in the business focus groups was more negative than in the groups with individuals, as the overarching opinion was businesses are being penalised, whilst individuals and their vehicles, which they felt contribute as much to poor air quality, are being allowed to “carry on as normal”.

*“Surely, I wouldn’t go out there and buy an old, you know, a dead old car which is pumping out a load of fumes and still be exempt from the scheme, surely? If so, then surely the scheme is flawed, and we are just being penalised?” (Public, G8, Mix of modes used, Live in poor air quality areas, Aged 18-34, Inside GM)*

Many respondents felt cars and vehicles will still be travelling through the region and on the motorways and not being penalised, but still contributing to the poor air quality levels.

*“So, you’ve got a situation where somebody with an older van, driving down their own street could be charged, whereas somebody can drive that same van all the way across the region on the motorway, which goes right through urban areas and they’re not charged?” (Business, LGV, B9, Construction / Retail, Inside GM)*

Some respondents in the groups were surprised at the size of the area:

*“I mean I thought they would more likely do the M60. Like the M60 is a ring road, because looking at the map before, there wasn’t much the other side, out of the M60. Wigan and Bolton and Bury. Yeah, poor old Bury Market, they’re a bit stressed about this, because it’s going to have quite an effect on them.” (Business, Minibus / Coach, B2, Outside GM)*

Some businesses felt the CAZ could make them go out of business due to the impossible task ahead of them when this comes in.

*“We might as well close the doors because there’s no way we can afford to run our vehicles at a daily charge, on top of what we’re losing already.” (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, B8, Inside GM)*

*“We’re the same, it’ll put us out of business. Hundreds of children are going to be without transport and then they [the big companies] will charge an absolute fortune because they’ll be the only ones with the vehicles. Where does this money come from? You know what I mean.” (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, B8, Inside GM)*

A handful of respondents in the groups mentioned specific reasons as to why the zone does not work for them or for specific locations.

*“You see I don’t go into the region every day for work. But I do live in Salford, so every time I leave home because our shop is based up in Chorley, I will be charged and yet I won’t be able to get any funding support because I work outside GM so I will be charged just to get to work.” (Business, B3: Retail, Outside GM)*

Some mentioned Manchester Airport and whether charges would be incurred for accessing the airport from outside of Greater Manchester. This coupled with the airport parking charges could result in an expensive journey to the airport.

*“Yes, but is that going to be the same, because going into Manchester Airport, if you did it as soon as you came off the M56, there’s also then narrow, you know, Greater Manchester roads.” (Business, Minibus / Coach, B2, Outside GM)*

## Times and Management of Operation

The proposed times of operation caused some concern with some of the business respondents due to how the operation hours would impact on their businesses.

*“If I’m working at night and overnight, i.e. from 9pm until 3am, then I’m going to get charged twice for the one shift? That will eat into my income, especially when those times are the main shifts I do.” (Taxi Driver Owner (Hackney), Salford)*



*“But how will this work for night drivers? How will the charge work? Surely that means as a night driver it will hit me more? Day drivers will any be charged one per shift. We will get charged twice potentially depending on how many night shifts we do back to back.” (Licensed PHV owner – own my vehicle, Manchester)*

None of the respondents in the individual groups had comments on this particularly. However, many respondents wanted more detail on the practicalities of how this was going to work, such as questions around:

- How will I be charged?
- How will it be enforced?
- What happens if I use my vehicle for both personal and commercial use?
- *“But I use my van for personal trips though? Am I going to be penalised for those trips also?” (Business, LGV, B10, Plumber, Inside GM)*
- Will you be able to pay a pass for a month to avoid doing this every day?

*“Is this going to be charged through like a daily charge with cameras involved to pick up vehicles?” (Business, Van, Inside GM)*

*“But I use my car for other trips than work. How will that work for me? I don’t understand. Will I get charged for using the same car to go the shops or pick up my kids?” (Licensed PHV driver – own my vehicle, Rochdale)*

In some groups, it was felt to be unreasonable to ask small businesses to prepare for this change in such a short timeframe, especially given the current circumstances around Covid-19. They felt the CAZ could be implemented later to allow small businesses the opportunity to prepare, given some businesses in the groups were not aware this was coming at all.

*“From my point of view if they made the M60 the boundary and gave us say ten years that would make it something that we could work towards, rather than just throwing in the towel. You know where you’d only pay if you went inside the M60.” (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, B8, Inside GM)*

## Vehicles and Exemptions

There is a list of proposed permanent exemptions, temporary exemptions and discounts compiled by GMCA as part of these proposals that were showed to respondents.

### Permanent Local Exemptions

Many of the individuals agreed with the list of exemptions and felt the correct vehicles were on the list.

*“They should be exempt anyway, yeah, yeah. I mean you’re not going to see many tanks driving round Manchester, are you? Obviously, ambulances and police, they’ve got to be exempt from it.” (Public, G2: Aged 40+, Bus / Taxi users within region, Outside GM)*

However, some individuals felt the list was too long, and many should not be exempt in order to reach the targets.

*“Because the objective is to promote clean air into the city centre or Greater Manchester even and yeah, you’d need to include everybody and I know that includes myself, because I’ve got a vehicle of my own, but yeah, if that’s the purpose of it and the intention is to reduce, yeah, sort of promote clean air and reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and whatnot, yeah, then it would include every driver and promote the electric vehicles and low emission vehicles.” (Public, G3: Aged 18-40, All with young families and children, Mix of modes used, Live in poor air quality areas, Inside GM)*

Many businesses questioned the vehicles currently included in the list and why those vehicles were included.

*“So, if you look permanent exemptions, Military Vehicles, so the Government are saying our vehicles are going to be exempt, emergency vehicles, so that’s Police, Vehicle and Operator Services Agency (VOSA), fire engines all exempt because that’s their money, and then further down you’ve got a Showman’s Guild Vehicle. So why should someone with a fair not have to pay when we have, and surely what we do is more important than a fairground once a year.” (Business, Minibus / Coaches, B8, Inside GM)*

*“Historic vehicles are gas guzzlers. They produce more pollution than like a modern car.” (Business, HGV / LGV, B7, Inside GM)*

During the discussions respondents questioned what was defined as a specialist vehicle and queried who defined it.

*“Looking at that information there, it says there’s not even a national database of these vehicles. So, who’s going to have the final say on what is a special vehicle that’s exempt?” (Business, HGV / LGV, B7, Inside GM)*

*“If you’re a scaffolder and you’ve got a twelve ton truck, that is your specialist HGV, because it saves you having a group of five lads hand boarding a load off. So, what you define as specialist and what I define as a specialist is like you say, it’s open to interpretation.” (Business, HGV / LGV, B7, Manufacturing / HGV Transport, Inside GM)*

Specifically, with the leisure HGV vehicles, respondents felt the charging should not be applicable to them and they should be permanently exempt from the charges as they are not being used commercially.

*“You know, I’m either going to have to get rid of my box, which I’ve spent a lot of time and effort saving up for and converting to give my daughter the facilities I never had as a child, you know. I bought my first horse at eighteen, you know, my daughter’s grown up with horses and to be able to give her and keep her off the streets by giving her such an all-encompassing hobby is something I always wanted to be able to do. This has the potential to throw that completely up in the air and to change my box down to a 3.5 ton van, which would still end up being charged, but is a possibility, again is not viable.” (Public, G12: Campervan / Horseboxes)*

*“I think a simple way around this would be to state that for vehicles like mine and like the campervans and that sort of thing is they only get charged if it’s being used in commercial use.” (Public, G12: Campervan / Horseboxes)*

### Temporary Local Exemptions

Many of the respondents did not have specific opinions on the temporary exemptions. One respondent felt some industries were not being treated the same as others which they felt was unfair, unrealistic and impractical.

*“I can’t see there’s anything missing, but like they seem at the moment to like be treating taxis and buses the same and from where I’m sitting I think it’s a little bit greener to get the bus, than to take a taxi just for yourself. So, I’d be interested to know if they’re going to treat them differently.” (Public, G8, Mix of modes used, Live in poor air quality areas, Aged 18-34, Inside GM)*

*“I don’t see why an operator who’s in the area should have an advantage over someone that isn’t. That nine months is, I mean nine months isn’t going to make much difference anyway, but we should all be taken in at the same time. It’s irrelevant where you’re based, if you’ve got a coach that’s going into Manchester, whether you’re in Manchester or out of Manchester, it should be compliant from the rollout date of spring 2022.” (Business, Minibus / Coaches, B2, Outside GM)*

## Charging

All respondents, both businesses and individuals, were asked to provide views on the proposed charges for all vehicles. There was a mixed response across the groups.

### Individuals

Most of the individuals thought the charging would encourage the changes needed to improve air quality, which they thought could only be a positive step in the longer term.

*“So, I think it’s good, because as part of what the Government is doing or how they can, because they can’t necessarily control people’s actions, but maybe a charge will. So, I think it’s good, also if I’m thinking about it from the angle of my health as well, you know what areas are clean as well, so I think that’s really good in that instance, yeah.” (Public, G8, Mix of modes used, Poor air quality areas, Low income, Aged 18-34, Inside GM)*

However, some respondents also thought it was interesting not all vehicles were included and questioned some of the vehicle types that had been selected for exemption.

*“I think it’s strange because there’s so many more people, there’s so many more cars and HGVs and vans for driving into town and I thought you’re meant to be encouraging the people, not just the businesses. It feels like you’re targeting just businesses, rather than individuals and I think it’s the individuals that need to actually do the groundwork and we all need to contribute, it’s not really going to have any effect on people, really.” (Public, G3, Mix of modes used, Poor air quality areas, all have young families or children, Aged 18-40, Inside GM)*

*“My first thought was like taxis and buses, they’re like huge vehicles and I don’t think that the companies are going to pay to upgrade them and you know people that are like taxi drivers, if they’ve got their own taxi, maybe they can’t afford to upgrade it to something that’s suitable. So, they’re probably just going to keep paying the charge every day and that’s probably just going to get passed on to the people that pay for the services.” (Public, G8, Mix of modes used, Poor air quality areas, Low income, Aged 18-34, Inside GM)*

Some respondents felt it was inevitable they would take some of the charges in the fares they pay going forward.

*“I mean you might get taxi prices and bus fares and things like that going a little bit higher for us now.” (Public, G5: Taxi / PHV Frequent Users, Inside GM)*

Some of the leisure HGV vehicle owners indicated they would avoid the region entirely as it was not worth going into the region for the charge and they can’t change their vehicle.

*“The charge means I just won’t go into the region. I won’t attend some of the riding schools there and I now won’t go to the garage that I have gone to for years because he is in Urmston, so I would be charged. It is a lot of money, but other people will lose out too.” (Public, G12, HGV Horsebox Owner, Outside GM)*

### Businesses

Many of the businesses felt the charges would impact on their business costs and could affect existing contracts that will still be in place through the implementation of the CAZ.

### HGVs

Many of the HGV businesses were unaware of the proposed charge for their vehicle to travel within the CAZ. Many felt the investment in getting these vehicles is a difficult enough situation without having to pay a charge to use it also.

*“Yeah, because obviously an HGV wagon, you don’t buy a new scaffolding wagon, anyway, do you know what I mean, they cost a fortune, but anything above like a 15*

*plate at the minute, you're going into like 20 grand and things, so I think I'll just hold back for five months. If I get money off it and it's going to reduce the charges that I'm going to be getting, because like I say, I could have nine vehicles out a day, one's an HGV and that's going to cost me £150 a day, it's dearer than my fuel, that." (Business, LGV / HGV, B4, Agriculture / Construction, Waste Management, Inside GM)*

For those companies with more than one HGV vehicle, from mental maths during the group, they believed those with a fleet would struggle to maintain the business with these charges in place, especially if they cannot afford to upgrade.

*We've got seventeen on the road at any one time, and ten of them at £60 per day, that's £600 per day and that would close the business down straightaway. I know there are some companies who have that number of vehicles who are just about breaking even." (Business, Depth, HGV, Waste Management)*

## Coaches / Minibuses

Many of the respondents were quick to work out the daily or weekly costs for them with the charges and how it would impact their businesses.

*"You've not got the £60 / day in your contract to just lose, we just haven't got it. We're not being pathetic and just saying it, it's actually true. We haven't got that much profit in them contracts, there's not a lot of profit in them to begin with." (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, Inside GM)*

They felt some of the existing contracts do not allow for these charges to be brought in and would cause already tightly costed jobs to be even more tight.

*"We're basically staying afloat with the school's contracts like the other guys are. We are just covering our costs really. The school's contracts don't really bring in any sort of profit, if any, but with the private work going as well and we don't know when it's coming back, we're all in the same boat really." (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, Inside GM)*

Several respondents felt coaches and minibuses were being unfairly targeted regarding the charges, especially as they can take several passengers at once, whilst often a car has a single person in it. It felt like they were only selecting certain industries which is an issue when they perceive others contribute to the air quality issues just as much.

*"My concern is the timescale and I think it is unfair to target industries like us, without targeting cars and all the other vehicles, because they're the ones that cause all the problems, we all see it. Hundreds of cars with one person in and they're paying nothing." (Business, Minibus / Coaches, B8, Inside GM)*

## LGVs / Vans

Respondents with small businesses, or sole traders with a van felt these charges could significantly affect their weekly costs.

*"Well, somebody who's a small builder or has their own small business, that's £50 a week in that van, that's £250 a month on top of your road tax and all the other taxis." (Business, LGV, B9, Construction / Retail, Inside GM)*

Some stated they would need to upgrade as the alternative of paying a daily charge would be uneconomical for them.

*"£60 a week, if I don't use it on a Sunday. It means I have to change the van, it's simple enough. It's not a choice, you can't take a £60 a week, that's £260 on a calendar month, isn't it, that would pay for a new van." (Business, LGV, B10, Inside GM)*

A couple of respondents felt this could cause businesses to use more lease vehicles rather than buying a new vehicle.



*“If it’s kind of pushing helping lease firms and things to be honest with you, which it might be a way to go, but I’ve always bought my stuff outright myself.” (Business, LGV, B10, Inside GM)*

## Taxi / PHV

Some felt the charges for taxi / PHV drivers was a step too far in the current climate and it would push them out of the industry potentially.

*“The industry is already struggling. Drivers won’t have that sort of money. This will force some of them to leave the industry.” (Hackney driver – own my vehicle, Tameside)*

Many drivers felt this was just another cost they must cover or pass onto the customer.

*If I only do that one job, I drive a minibus, if I only do that one job, that minibus that I charge £35 for, that I’ve paid £6 to pick up at the airport, I’m now paying £7 to have my vehicle on the road, I’m going to pay an insurance and I’m paying fuel, I’ve got charge that customer pretty much, I have to charge that customer, the price will have to go up from £35 to £48, just to justify how much I earn off it at the moment.” (Licensed private hire driver – own my vehicle, Trafford)*

A couple of drivers felt a charge on some vehicles and not others means some drivers will not be as competitive as others.

*“Especially when you’re in competition with everybody else for being more competitive with your prices and everything and then getting charged on top of that, I don’t know, it’s just unfair. I totally appreciate the green air, I totally appreciate that everybody wants to have clean air and we need to get our emissions down and everything, but it just feels that it should be a national thing for everybody to do and not just one group in society to do it.” (Licensed private hire operator – own our vehicles, Wigan)*

## Funding

Across the groups, respondents were shown the potential funding options available and were asked for their opinions on them.

### Clean Bus Fund

Applicants would need to demonstrate they are the registered bus service operating in Greater Manchester and have been for at least 12 months prior to application for the funding. As part of this qualitative research, a bus / coach / minibus group based both inside and outside Greater Manchester were included. Individuals in the members of the public groups were also shown information about this funding.

Individuals in general were positive about the funding across the different vehicles, recognising their flexibility and role in taking people to multiple destinations and removing lots of separate cars from the roads.

*“Yes, you know, it’s really positive, you know, that they will be given funding, because perhaps that will give people the opportunity to purchase like cleaner vehicles and that will have an impact. You know, my concern was that it wouldn’t have, you know, the actual tax itself, well, you know, charge itself wouldn’t have that much impact. But I think if funding is available, as well and that, you know, encourages people to purchase cleaner vehicles, then that’s the real positive, I think.” (Public, G2: Modes used within region, Aged 40+ Outside GM)*

*“I think they should really be focusing on people, encouraging people to get on public transport and upgrading the public transport and not penalising the cab drivers and the taxi drivers.” (Public, G3: Mix modes used, All with young families or children, Aged 18-40, Live in poor air quality areas, Inside GM)*

Many businesses just struggled with the idea of how much it was going to cost them and their business.

*“Bigger firms don’t need the support as much. Definitely not, because they can cater for the needs and requirements. They’re already compliant because most of Stagecoach vehicles are already electric and they’re all brand new.” (Business, Minibus / Coaches, B8, Inside GM)*

*“I’m not impressed with the cost of it. We’re all really struggling at the minute, like everybody here with the COVID. I have spoken to my MP about this and they’ve offered us £16,500, which is nowhere near, where are we supposed to get the rest of the money from?” (Business, Minibus / Coaches, B8, Inside GM)*

One of the companies explained investing in vehicles and the contracts they have usually require a lead in of many years.

*As I say when you put in for school contracts these last ones are for four years and you’ve got to try and guess what’s happening in four years’ time, so it’s impossible anyway. But like the other contracts I’ve got if they are Euro 5 on them and I’m going to get a £9 charge on them, then that’s most of your profits gone out of that job anyway.” (Business, Coaches / Minibuses, B8, Inside GM)*

### Clean Commercial Fund

The Clean Commercial Fund is proposed to support eligible non-compliant coaches, minibuses, HGVs and vans to upgrade to a compliant vehicle.

### Coaches and Minibuses

Some businesses questioned the criteria determined by the government framework for what was defined as ‘compliant’ and whether that would remain the same in the future.

*“It is as it is but this vague there’s going to be funds here and grants here, until you know what the criteria is, it doesn’t really mean anything does it.” (Business, Minibus / Coaches, B8, Inside GM)*

*“I’m thinking that currently Euro 6 it is, what’s the next step, do we go Euro 7, Euro 8? When do we get to the point where we’re not constantly improving air quality and they’re constantly passing costs on to smaller companies, because the major of wagon companies are quite large fleets. The majority of coach companies, there’s more small operators that run four or five, six or eight vehicles, where does it stop and ultimately, we as operators have to cover those costs, it has to come from somewhere and where it comes from is our customers.” (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, B2, Outside GM)*

Some specific businesses or individuals felt the Clean Commercial Fund will not go far enough to help them upgrade, especially in current circumstances.

*“It’s £5,000 towards a minibus and to get a Euro 6 even a Ford Transit you’re looking at about £27,000 so £5,000 towards that is another £22,000 per vehicle times three, so it’s a big debt that you’re getting yourself into for the sake of earning not enough.” (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, B8, Inside GM)*

Coach companies based outside the region reported they would be unlikely to invest in their fleets, especially as they would not be entitled to support. They stated costs would have to be passed to customers and therefore, they are likely to move some of the package day trips to areas other than Greater Manchester to maintain their competitiveness.

*“Well, I think from my point of view it’s penalising the people that are bringing revenue into the city. To all the businesses in the city that we bring people to, then it’s penalising those people, because we’re not going to do it, because I’m not going to invest in Euro 6 vehicles, not in the immediate future anyway, not at least in the immediate future, no way. Ultimately the passenger is going to pay the cost. You’re penalising operators outside of Manchester whilst giving them grants while they’re inside Manchester and extending the time limit for them. That’s unfair on the industry as a whole. Yeah and you’re devaluing everybody’s fleet, whether they’re in Manchester or they’re not, by*

*bringing this in you are devaluing their fleet.” (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, Outside GM)*

Businesses outside Greater Manchester felt they were being penalised by not being offered the same funding as those inside the boundary.

*“They’re doing the complete opposite than what is needed. They’re making it more expensive to go into Manchester in an environmentally friendly vehicle, but it’s Euro 4 or Euro 6, just by the sheer number of people we’d be carrying. I think the advantages to being in Greater Manchester are completely unfair to operators that are outside, you know, they’re getting an extra nine months, they’re getting the extra funding to do it and the nine months.” (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, B2, Outside GM)*

Minibus companies based outside Greater Manchester stated they would be unlikely to invest in a new vehicle, particularly as they would not be entitled to support and ultimately will pass the charge on to customers.

*“But there might be the issue that if they don’t want to pay, so you say to them it’s £200 to go to Chester, it’s £260 to go to Manchester, they’re just going to pick to go somewhere different. And so, Manchester loses as well, doesn’t it, because they haven’t got the tourism coming in.” (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, B2, Inside GM)*

These companies felt upgrading their fleets in the current climate when the pipeline of work is uncertain would not be a secure investment.

*“Oh, course it is, but even so, to buy a fleet of those minibuses and just do school runs and the airport as you were saying, it would still be difficult, it’s not just because of the COVID situation. (Business, Minibuses / Coaches, B8, Inside GM)*

## HGV

Whilst some businesses were appreciative of the financial support potentially on offer, many felt it would not cover the whole cost of a vehicle and that was a problem for them.

*“Regarding our line of work, I’ve been heavily involved in it, especially with the vehicles update, because one of our vehicles, in excess of 250 tons, so the replacement vehicle we purchased last year actually came, I think it cost just under a quarter of a million pounds to replace one vehicle. So, you sit there, and you look at it, obviously the ongoing extent is with the low emission zone come in and the reinvestment in equipment, just to keep it within this low emissions bracket, it does have quite a knock-on effect with obviously profit margins and everything else.” (Business, HGV, B7, Manufacturing / HGV Transport, Inside GM)*

It was also queried whether this had the possibility of affecting competition between businesses based inside and outside of the boundary.

*“So, some of our competitors based outside the region will still have to pay the charge but won’t get the funding support. I wonder if that means they will just concentrate on other areas? (Business, HGV, B7, Manufacturing / HGV transport, Inside GM)*

*“I think it makes it uncompetitive to work in Greater Manchester and if you could work somewhere else, I think you’d choose to do so. If you were setting up a new business you’d choose to do it in a different zone, I think.” (Business, HGV, B7, Manufacturing / HGV Transport, Inside GM)*

Those owning leisure HGV vehicles felt the cost just won’t go far enough to help.

*“Funding won’t go far enough. Not with specialist vehicles, because to me a horsebox is a specialist vehicle, you know, it’s not just a box, you know, there’s a lot of things that go into making that safe to transport up to three half ton animals at the end of the day.” (Public, G12: Campervan / Horseboxes)*

## LGV

Some felt the funding was supportive and respondents were relieved they would have the option to apply for support, rather than upgrade by themselves.

*"I'm glad it's there. Yeah, you know, it can't not help, can it, really, it's a decent chunk of money towards a vehicle." (Business, LGV, Bus10, Van Owners, Inside GM)*

A couple of businesses were still processing the information as part of the group and felt they needed to investigate the funding a bit more before being totally convinced but felt if they were eligible, they would apply.

*"I need to upgrade but was not aware of this before today's call. I think I need to wait and understand more before I go ahead and upgrade now. If there is support and I'm eligible then I should apply for that." (Business, LGV, B5, Night-time economy, Inside GM)*

Some questioned where the money for the funding was coming from in the first place, especially if the charges do not cover the funding.

*"And if part of its, if the charges don't cover the funding, then where is the money for the funding coming from, is that central Government?" (Business, LGV, B9, Construction / Retail, Inside GM)*

Some businesses wondered if there would even be enough funding to support everyone who needs it.

*"I'd apply for it, but I think I'd be annoyed if I applied for it and I was told there wasn't any left." (Business, LGV, B10, Inside GM)*

Some businesses questioned the availability and suitability of electric vans and whether they would look to purchase those in the future.

*"I personally don't think electric vans are where they need to be yet, you know, a lot of the time we're towing heavy trailers, big heavy trailers or a good load in the back of a van and that must reduce that 70 mile range to 30. You know, we've got two vans loaded up for the morning and they're at their limit now and I'll do half as many miles to the gallon as I should do tomorrow." (Business, LGV, B10, Inside GM)*

Lastly, some businesses thought the plan to implement the CAZ has already reduced the second-hand value of vehicles they rely on to part fund their next switch. Therefore, they have a greater funding gap if they want to upgrade.

*"I was going to say the natural progression of obviously selling the older trucks and purchasing the new ones, that's fine, like most hauliers have five or six specialist vehicles they might run them a little bit longer, seven or eight years, but the issue we've got now is because of all these clean air zones that have been planned, it's wiped out the second hand market. So, we had a truck that pre clean air zone, we were guaranteed a 45 grand buy back, by the supplier. This has all come in now and he went, I won't even buy it off you now. So, I'm now stuck with a noncompliant truck, no-one wants to buy it because these clean air zones, nobody wants them, which is a knock-on impact which a lot of people don't see." (Business, HGV, B7, Inside GM)*

*I'm not against the proposal, but we kind of like, we talked about it and we know that the same as in London, if you want to buy a Euro 5 vehicle in London it's cheaper than up here, because people don't want them down there and we feel that if you're going to be selling a second hand vehicle, it's going to be devalued because of this charge and then obviously you've got the expense of buying a newer one as well or three. (Business, LGV, B10, Inside GM)*

*"We are expected to support the rest of the purchase with savings or finance? Finance is far too risky right now. Would they even lend to people given what is going on?" (Business, LGV, B6, Retail, Inside GM)*

Some of these businesses felt the timescales to make these changes were unrealistic.

*"Yes, you're getting fifteen months to be told that you're going to have to invest an awful lot of money, basically." (Business, LGV, B9, Inside GM)*

Members of the public stated they think this fund is a good idea and it will help businesses upgrade more successfully.

*"This is a good idea as I'm sure some smaller businesses would struggle otherwise."  
(Public, G3: Mix of modes used, Aged 18-40, All have young families, Live in poor air quality areas, Inside GM)*

## Clean Taxi Fund

The Clean Taxi Fund was proposed as a fund to support the upgrade of non-compliant hackney carriage / PHVs to cleaner compliant vehicles.

Whilst most of the drivers interviewed as part of the qualitative exercise recognised the funding was a step in the right direction, there was consensus it didn't go far enough and upgrading their vehicle was too much of a risk currently due to Covid-19. This was consistent amongst hackney and PHV drivers and operators.

## Hackney

Many of the hackney drivers and operators recognised the funding was a positive step and would support many drivers. However, many thought even with the funding, it may not be possible for some drivers to take the step and upgrade.

*"The funding is a great idea, but our situation right now is just awful. The industry is struggling and even if the funding sounds like a good idea, I doubt many people would take the risk. We are barely taking home 30% of our normal earnings and still having to find money for insurance, maintenance, licensing etc. COVID-19 means a lot of drivers won't take the risk." (Taxi, Hackney driver – own my vehicle, Salford)*

*"Well, yeah, but if they turn round and say I've got to pay 50 grand for a cab and they only give me 5, I've still got to find 45 grand and it just doesn't stack up for anybody and the finance companies are going to stop, as I say, they've already stopped these super cheap deals, the low deposit deals and all that and they're going to turn round and look at, scrutinise your books before they do anything." (Taxi Operator, Stockport)*

Although there were many comments in support of electric taxis, there was concern from some hackney carriage respondents about the performance of electric vehicles and availability of electric vehicle infrastructure.

*"70,000 miles he said he'd done, and his batteries are goosed, and he didn't realise how much the batteries were. It's all right for 180 miles, then you get 160 miles and as the batteries start to die and get weaker and weaker you start getting electrical problems, you're getting forty miles, fifty miles, you've got to replace them for new ones then. So that's the problem with having electric vehicles on, good for the environment, but rubbish for the job, unless Tesla with their million-mile battery come along with a decent priced vehicle." (Taxi operator, Tameside)*

Other hackney carriage owners and drivers felt funding should not be available for PHVs, they should have already been upgraded, or they should use their own money. Some felt as a business, drivers should be responsible for funding their own upgrade or already ensuring they have a compliant vehicle so the money could be put to better use in other ways.

*"In 2022, they shouldn't be coming with a 2014 car, it's going to be eight years. For an existing licence, even so in 2015, you should be at the point where you're looking at changing it, so I suppose COVID has kind of caused an issue with it, but pre COVID my opinion wasn't, bearing in mind this was from '21, my opinion is you should have a compliant car, you should have a Euro 6 car for private hire drivers, but taxi drivers is a different thing." (Licensed Operator, Tameside)*

Some questioned finding the finance to upgrade in the first place and how it would not necessarily be possible for everyone, even with the support of the Clean Taxi Fund.



*"Well, yeah, but if they turn round and say I've got to pay 50 grand for a cab and they only give me 5, I've still got to find 45 grand and it just doesn't stack up for anybody and the finance companies are going to stop, as I say, they've already stopped these super cheap deals, the low deposit deals and all that and they're going to turn round and look at, scrutinise your books before they do anything." (Licensed Operator, Stockport)*

Some drivers however, stated it was untenable regardless of the finer detail due to the existing finance they have; the investment they have made in the vehicle already and the fact the industry and their income is currently in dire straits as a result of Covid-19; it was considered too much of a risk in the current climate.

*"If somebody offered me 10 grand to go and buy a new vehicle I wouldn't accept it, because you're still looking at £30,000 finance, do you know what I mean, £30-40,000 finance." (Licensed hackney driver – own my vehicle, Stockport).*

## PHV

A few private hire drivers felt it was just something they had to accept and find the finance and use the funding support to upgrade.

*Yeah, definitely and it is going to be difficult, it'll affect us all, without a shadow of a doubt, but yeah, what can we do, we've got to comply with it, we don't have the choice, do we? (Licensed private hire driver, - own my vehicle, Bury)*

Like hackney owners, PHV owners also suggested the idea of upgrading their vehicle was a daunting prospect and an unlikely step at the present moment in time.

*"The world is so up in the air right now. Any investment is a risk at the moment and when you have a mortgage to pay and a family to support and you can't even guarantee going out and earning enough just to cover your weekly costs (petrol, insurance, fees, any servicing or maintenance) then how can they expect people to upgrade vehicles and take on part of the expense with personal savings or loans. I won't do that; I will leave the industry before taking something on like that at this time. The industry is struggling." (Licensed private hire driver – own my vehicle, Bury)*

A couple of drivers mentioned they would need achievable payment terms for any sort of upgrade investment, for either the purchase of the vehicle or the payment back for the finance to fill the gap.

*"Or something, you know, easy for drivers to pay monthly, because we're all earning on a daily basis." (Licensed private hire driver – own my vehicle, Trafford)*

Some drivers however were adamant even with the funding, the idea of upgrading is just not an option at the moment.

*"in one of the most deprived towns in the whole of the UK, I simply can't afford it. I cannot afford to upgrade my car. I only do about 20,000 miles a year, now you want me to upgrade my car to a newer model car and on top of that you want it to be fully electrical in a few years down the line. Where will I charge my car, in my dad's garage or somewhere? We're living on the streets in terraced houses, how are we going to charge the car with power points, there'll be fewer people queuing up to charge their cars, then. So, it's just illogical." (Licensed private hire driver – own my vehicle, Rochdale)*

*So, from £1,000 you won't be able to buy with £1,000, you won't be able to get bodywork for £1,000, so people end up losing, leaving the trade. I don't know about Manchester or Stockport or the more posher areas, anyway, but in Rochdale a £1,000 grant, it won't even cover the bodywork for the spray, not even an engine. So, it's serious, people can't afford it." (Licensed private hire driver – own my vehicle, Rochdale)*

## Try Before You Buy

Respondents were also informed of a 'Try Before You Buy' proposal, which is an initiative for Greater Manchester licensed hackney carriage drivers to have the opportunity to hire and assess the use of an electric hackney vehicle before making an investment. This is intended to address any uncertainties about costs, range issues and availability of charging points.

*"I can see that scheme working with some drivers and companies. Gives them an opportunity to try it out." (Taxi / PHV Users, Inside GM)*

*"I can't see many drivers opting into that. No sense. We have enough going on without taking a scheme like that on." (Licensed hackney driver – own my vehicle, Stockport).*

Some felt although the scheme might be a good idea, they also thought electric vehicles are too expensive, and upgrade is unaffordable to many hackney carriage drivers.

*"To buy an electric vehicle you're looking at £56,000. Now, if you want to put that in perspective I owe £19,000 on my mortgage, that £19,000 will have me working, I am working now by twenty hours, so where's the decision, where do you make the decision on that? Do you saddle yourself up with £50,000? The Government, even if they offer, I think they're thinking at the moment it's £10,000, they're looking at offering £10,000, you're still looking at £46,000, do you know what I mean?" (Licensed hackney driver – own my vehicle, Stockport)*

*"A brand-new electric cab, the bottom end is £55,000. So even if they gave you £17,500 towards one of those vehicles, you're saddling somebody with a debt of almost £30,000." (Licensed hackney driver – own my vehicle, Salford)*

Some drivers felt the infrastructure and technology is not far enough along with the electric cab to make it cost effective in the long run. The practicalities of having an electric cab could be an issue for some drivers.

*"I mean I'd more than look at hybrids to start off. I wouldn't go all electric, because the facilities to charge for a taxi, whether you like it or not you do twelve hour shifts and then it jumps to someone else to do another twelve hour shift, so the car's doing a twenty four hour shift every day, but it needs to be maintained, looked after and charged and at the moment there's no places to charge, not enough places to charge them." (Licensed hackney driver – lease my vehicle, Salford)*

*"I know a two-year-old electric car, it needs batteries already and it's costing him £1,200 and he wished he's never bought it now." (Licensed hackney driver – own my vehicle, Stockport)*

One respondent highlighted the issue with electric vehicles for people with hearing impairments as they cannot hear the vehicles coming.

*"Actually there are particular issues for electric vehicles for disabled people, because they don't have any noise and therefore if you don't understand that there might be deaf and hard of hearing people, children and people with learning difficulties or dementia that might not actually see the electric, you know, be aware of the electric vehicle, you need to have a much more stringent driving standards." (Disabled hackney / PHV user)*

## Impact of the Proposals - Individuals

Because private cars are not included in the proposal, most individuals did not feel the impact would be great on them. However, there were concerns businesses would pass the cost of the daily charge onto customers. The impact of this was twofold;

1. **Reduced disposable income:** some felt if charges were passed onto them as customers, they would have to reduce their expenditure.
2. **Negative impact on the economy:** some were concerned their reduced expenditure would have a knock-on effect to the GM economy and although their personal reduction

in spend maybe small for example, one less trip or one less coffee - if many people were reducing their spend in this way, then the cumulative effect could be great.

*"It will affect like daily trips. Taxis are expensive enough from Bury to town, so if it's going to cost me even more, it means that when I get to town I can spend less, because I've still only got the same budget. You know, I mean it's not a massive budget, it's not a tiny budget, but I know what I've got to spend and it just means that a shop or the cafes and restaurants or the theatres, when they're open again are not getting the same amount of money from me or from anybody else who's had to travel in on a taxi, because it's cost them more money to get to town." (Public, G12, Campervan / Horsebox)*

*"And there's all the small businesses, isn't there, all the trades people are going to be passing on costs to the customers, so if you need a plumber to come out and fix your central heating, there's going to be a bit extra on your bill if you pick one based inside the region." (Public, G1: Aged 18-40, Bus and Taxi users within the region, Outside GM)*

*"If costs went up that much because they were passing the charge on to me, then I would be forced to use my car more as it would be less costly" (Taxi / PHV User)*

## Impact of the Proposals - Businesses

### Coaches / Minibuses

Most of the coach and minibus respondents were unconvinced the GM CAP will solve the issue at hand without it being too damaging to other parts of the region and transport network. Some respondents felt it will drive up costs of using public transport, which is the opposite of what they felt should be happening.

*"I think the whole plan isn't going to cure it at all. They need to be hitting the cars, getting people out of their cars and onto public transport or walking or not going into city centres, and the only way to do that is by charging them and making the transport into Manchester cheaper, and the cheapest way is large-scale coaches, buses, trains. But by doing this, they're doing the complete opposite. They're making it more expensive to go into Manchester in an environmentally friendly vehicle, but it's Euro 4 or Euro 6, just by the sheer number of people we'd be carrying." (Business, Minibus / Coach, B2, Outside GM)*

Many felt the consequence of proposals would be a rise in costs which will likely be passed on to the customer in some way. Respondents felt their services were used by care homes, housing associations and school groups, where budgets are tight and are least likely to be able to afford an increase in cost. It was felt these groups were looking for the cheapest trips, rather than a chosen destination and therefore would travel to destinations outside Greater Manchester if it were cheaper.

*"People are going to have to pay more. I mean I couldn't possibly run my company now buying all these vehicles at the same price as last year. Costs have got to go up because of these vehicles, so I am obviously going to be dearer than all the rest of the guys on here, that's the way it is, so the costs have got to go up." (Business, Minibus / Coach, B8, Inside GM)*

*"And so, you know, if we say, oh, Manchester Christmas markets £460 or you can go to Liverpool market for £400. Bye bye Manchester." (Business, Minibus / Coach, B2, Outside GM)*

Businesses felt more time was needed. Many businesses do not make financial decisions or investments overnight, and many of the decisions they do make are decided with a three, four, or five-year timescale. Coach companies mentioned the return on investment and long-term financial planning throughout their responses in the groups.

*"The problem is you can't just put things in with a year's notice. We need a long period of notice, because it is a slow moving industry, really. I don't mean like you should say,*



*right, you've got a year to do it, you know, you'd say it's five years or in ten years, you've got to be at this point, because within that ten years or five years, operators would have updated the fleet anyway." (Business, Minibus / Coach, B2, Outside GM)*

Businesses based outside of Greater Manchester felt they were further disadvantaged as they would not be entitled to funding support, yet they help to support and bring people into the region and contribute to the economy.

*"Well, I think from my point of view, it's penalising the people that are bringing revenue into the city. To all the businesses in the city that we bring people to, then it's penalising those people, because we're not going to do it, because I'm not going to invest in Euro 6 vehicles, not in the immediate future anyway, not at least in the immediate future, no way. Ultimately the passenger is going to pay the cost. You're penalising operators outside of Manchester whilst giving them grants while they're inside Manchester and extending the time limit for them. That's unfair on the industry as a whole. Yeah, and you're devaluing everybody's fleet, whether they're in Manchester or they're not, by bringing this in you are devaluing their fleet." (Business, Minibus / Coach, B2, Outside GM)*

A handful of respondents went as far as to say these proposals will effectively put them out of business, as they will not be able to compete going forward.

*"We're just going to have to close up shop, and it's something that's going to stop you doing something that you've been doing for a long period of time, and it's a shame." (Business, Coach, B8, Inside GM)*

*"We're the same, it'll put us out of business. Hundreds of children are going to be without transport and then your big boys like Stagecoach will charge an absolute fortune because they'll be the only ones with the vehicles. Where does this money come from? You know what I mean." (Business, Coach, B8, Inside GM)*

Some businesses felt it would just divert businesses elsewhere and the proposals are not targeting all non-compliant vehicles.

*"I would say that they need to look strongly at charging cars and not charging taxis. I would say that from my point of view it will be taking people away from Manchester, the Christmas markets and the school trips and the shopping trips will be going elsewhere, rather than paying this additional charge and not for one moment would it make me consider signing up to the finance on the Euro 6 coach, not for a moment." (Business, Coaches, B2, Outside GM)*

Many felt their industries are currently struggling and the proposals would impact them further with additional costs, finance and investment for the future.

*"I think the big issue is the industry has got no money. We've all had nine months, pretty much twelve months without earning any money. Nobody's going to have the money to invest in vehicles next year. Nobody's investing this year, so everybody's a year behind where they were. There's not going to be the money next year, because we're not going to be as busy." (Business, Minibus / Coaches, B2, Outside GM)*

There were also some respondents who thought the proposals do very little to encourage people out of their cars for the future.

*"I am a green operator which costs me a lot of money and a lot of work. This is just one thing that will encourage more people to use the car. So, if you've got a minibus carrying 15 children, that would be 15 more cars on the road because if that minibus isn't there. So, what's that doing to congestion." (Business, Minibus / Coaches, Inside GM)*

## HGVs

Some respondents stated they will wait for the final decisions and information to be finalised after the consultation and then look to apply for funding and upgrade their vehicles, rather than struggling to do it now using just their own funds.

*"I am not doing that now, I might as well sit and wait until April. I was looking into it, I've got a new employee starting tomorrow, one of the first jobs will be to get on the phone and get some prices for two sort of transit size vans, either 2.5 - 7.5 tipper truck, between those levels, but now I'm going to sit and wait. There's no way I'm going to spend that money." (Business, LGV / HGV, B4, Agriculture / Construction, Waste Management, Inside GM)*

Some businesses with HGVs saw the advantage of upgrading, as the daily charge would be a large cost to take on and absorb, or alternatively pass on to their clients. However, investment and the normal lifespan they get out of vehicles could be a problem for upgrading.

*"Maybe upgrading vehicles, because there's no point us upgrading if beforehand, we may as well wait to get the £5,500 contribution if we have to, because obviously these vehicles can last ten or twelve years, so we don't normally upgrade them until they need it." (Business, HGV, Depth, Waste Management, Inside GM)*

A couple of companies with more than 1 HGV stated obtaining the finance to invest in new vehicles was going to be an issue, especially now.

*"The thing to consider also is with the current COVID situation, everyone's credit ratings will be getting downgraded anyway, because of, you know, there's a lot of hesitancy out there for people to lend, isn't there, at the moment. So, even if you know, twelve months, two years, you could have got the credit, maybe you might be downgraded 10% or something, you know, 50%, you don't know until you need it. But a lot of companies won't be in the same position now than they were twelve months ago." (Business, HGV, B7, Inside GM)*

## LGVs / Vans

A small number of the business respondents felt this was a good idea and would impact in a positive way longer term.

*"I have to agree, yeah, you are right, of course it's our responsibility to be introduced, because it's a good impact. It will bite us financially and impact on the businesses, but in the long run, you know, for the environment we should leave this planet safer for the new generation, so yes, this is our responsibility, you're right." (Business, LGV, Bus6, Retail, Inside GM)*

*"Personally, yes, it's an initiative in the right direction and its aims and objectives and obviously it will be oriented and of course, yeah, once it's implemented in good vehicles and on the roads, so you have a nice, a good consumption, a good environment. Yes, it's the right step in the right direction, yeah." (Business, LGV, B6: Retail, Inside GM)*

A couple of van owners, however, stated this is an unforeseen expense for them and now they are going to have to upgrade or pay the charge and they can't afford to absorb the cost of the charges.

*"I only purchased a van recently but it won't be compliant. So I'm going to have to find a newer one instead. I can't afford to pay the charge each time." (Business, LGV, B10, Mixed Businesses, Inside GM)*

## Hackney / PHV

A few of the drivers stated the changes in working cultures mean the industry as a whole is struggling and may not recover.

*"There is no business trade now. Everyone is working from home. All the big offices, no one there. All been done online so there is no business trade, not like there used to be." (Licensed private hire driver – own my vehicle, Tameside)*

Many of the drivers and operators felt the timetable for the proposals was too short and was forcing something that could instead be done through natural transition over a longer period.

*"Natural transition - let everybody get back on their feet before you try and hammer them again, because if you're going to hammer people, they're just not going to use*

*that service. They're going to say, no, I'm not doing that school contract anymore, they're going to hand them back into the councils and then on the first day of September in 2022, whatever it is and the council's come begging, please, please help me out. Why force it? (Licensed operator – own and lease vehicles, Stockport)*

*“That's our concern, not the Clean Air Act in itself, but the timeframe with which things are trying to be done by, which with particularly with this COVID 19, you know, pandemic, which looks like now it's going to be at least a year is just thrown, you know, drove a cart and horse through all the plans regarding the other vehicles and everything else, what is financially viable and practical. (Licensed operator, Salford)*

*“So they can't go changing things, it's going to need a long time after this has finished, it's going to be next year before we start getting back to a normality, I reckon, at least April, May, like if they've brought in any new standards for the year after, it's just a continuous loss of money for all the drivers.” (Licensed private hire driver – own my vehicle, Tameside)*

Some drivers and operators felt a lot of money had already been invested in their vehicles and they will not receive the monetary worth of their existing vehicle if they upgrade earlier than when they had planned to.

*“Yeah, yeah, but you know, like what you've got to remember, these clean air things, you can't just bring it in like that, clean air, it has to be done from a date, doesn't it? You know, like you let the vehicles work themselves out over time. A lot of these black cabs, they're invested to do that and then carry on.” (Licensed hackney driver – own my vehicle, Salford)*

Some of the more elderly drivers who have invested many years in the industry felt they are too late in their careers to be considering a significant investment to upgrade their vehicle or take on daily charges. One respondent, who is currently in his late 60s, said the implementation of these proposals will force him into retirement.

*“Yes, I've got a rough idea of what they're proposing, what they want to do, yeah. They basically want people to have new vehicles and clean the air up and tidy up the drivers to make them respectable as well as the vehicles. It will make me retire.” (Hackney owner driver, Trafford)*

Some of the older drivers we spoke to also felt that, whilst other drivers are leaving the industry and finding other employment during Covid-19, they often found themselves to be in a position where age puts them at a disadvantage.

*“I've been doing this job for thirty years now, which is the only job I know, and I can't apply for another job, because I've got no qualifications. I'd be getting as a driver or an Uber driver or Uber Eats, you know, working in that kind of industry, where I've got no experience anyway, but all it is, it's just driving and just delivering. So, that's the only qualifications that I have that I can really get into and plus my age now, I'm 54 years old, you know, especially when I've been doing taxis since I was twenty years old, you know, it's going to be hard for me, especially at my age now.” (Licensed private hire driver – own my vehicle, Rochdale).*

## Impact of Covid-19

Throughout the focus groups with individuals and businesses, many references were made to Covid-19 and the impact it is having on lives and livelihoods. Therefore, it was important to understand how Covid-19 is impacting on both types of respondents.

## Effect of Covid-19 on Individuals

Most respondents reported their travel behaviour and others had changed during Covid-19 and, therefore, had most likely had an effect on air pollution. In many of the groups, respondents debated how travel choices had changed; people were working from home more due to restrictions and the current government advice not to use public transport where possible. In some cases, respondents felt this was “pushing people into their cars more” if they need to travel at all.

Those respondents classed as key workers under government guidance reported their travel behaviour had not changed during the pandemic, but they have noticed differences for others around them.

*“Yeah, so I’m a key worker as well, I’m a support worker, so I’ve carried on working and I rely on my car for work, so I’ve not really seen much of a difference transport wise, apart from in the first lockdown, it was much easier to get around Rochdale where I was working. You know, the second lockdown, it doesn’t seem as though very many people are locked down, you know.” (Public, G12: Campervan / Horseboxes)*

Many respondents felt the “new normal” is unlikely to change any time soon and the new culture of working from home is likely to become more prominent in the future. Respondents felt this new way of working is favourable and a more hybrid approach in the future may be the preferable amongst workers.

*“I’ve been working at home since March and I think it’s going to continue for some time really, and I think it’s changed, you know, certainly my like office environment. I think everybody’s thinking it’s never going to back, because I only worked three days anyway, you know, but I don’t think I’ll be going back to working three days in the office at all, really. Perhaps I might be just doing one day, one day a week or something in the office, but the rest of the time, I think it’s going to continue to be at home for the foreseeable future.” (Public, G2: Aged 40+, Bus / Taxi users within region, Outside GM)*

Some respondents highlighted the indirect impacts of people working from home more and not going into city centres or key shopping hubs and, due to restrictions, this has impacted the delivery and courier industry.

*“It’s impacted me because I don’t use transport as much as before, but the thing now is, it’s had those indirect impacts, because you’re not using transportation as much anymore, but you’re sitting at home and you’re ordering so much, and the trucks and the buses are delivering the others, so indirectly, I’m still contributing to be honest. I’m ordering much more than I did before.” (Public, G8, Mix of modes used, Live in poor air quality areas, Aged 18-34, Inside GM)*

## Effect of Covid-19 on Businesses

After the initial first weeks of the first lockdown in March 2021, a proportion of businesses respondents felt they adjusted to the restrictions and have managed to trade at the same level or at a higher level than since before Covid-19. They stated this is due to some of their supply chains being able to still use their services during the pandemic.

*“I mean immediately when the outbreak started, we basically shut down, but only for two weeks until our customer base got a feel for what was going on and realised that construction could keep going, and since then, we’ve never looked back. We’ve probably had one of the best years ever, because car parks are closed or some are and some country parks have been closed, we’ve been able to get into those parks, car parks etc, to install, whereas normally, they’re full of people and cars. So, it’s worked better for us.” (Business, HGV / LGV, B1: Agriculture, Construction, Outside GM)*

*“COVID-19 has been very up and down. I do a lot of, basically I do a lot of NHS maintenance, schoolwork and local authorities, so obviously, I’m committed to regional work which is primary healthcare to Manchester. We had a very quiet two or three months, but there was only me working, really, because I employ a lot of day work subcontract lads, who I employ maybe nine or ten months of the year and kept those*

*ticking over, but my own employees, because we couldn't go into the schools and we couldn't go in the NHS, it was a bit quiet for three months, but as it stands now, I've never been as busy." (Business, LGV / HGV, B4, Agriculture / Construction, Waste Management, Inside GM)*

Some businesses explained they had needed to adapt and to change their methods and processes in order to survive the pandemic, but they felt afterwards they may have benefited from Covid-19.

*"We moved onto online. We set up a new website. We sold an awful lot online. We actually sold more online than we would have sold usually in the shop in the first three months, so it worked. It worked well for us. It does have some consequences though – increase in postage costs and courier costs for example." (Business, B3: Retail, Outside GM)*

*"I was going to say we do a lot of events, so that sector has just completely been wiped out. The bank asked me to do like a look into what it financially is to us, and it's about a quarter of a million in revenue, which we lost over night, and there's no sight of that coming back, but we have diversified and gone out and done different work now, to the point where we've put another two trucks on the road over the last two months, that's obviously down to the workload. Like I say, similar to the other guys, when the first lockdown came it was like whoa, shock, my artics (articulated lorries) got parked up overnight, because they're working in the event stuff, but then things carry on, generators are still needed, that's the majority of our work." (Business, HGV, B7, Manufacturing / HGV transport, Inside GM)*

However, some businesses felt Covid-19 has had a significantly detrimental impact on their businesses, and they are struggling to survive and remain financially viable due to the lack of business in 2020. They also feel there is much uncertainty for 2021 and beyond for their businesses.

*"We are event florists, and we haven't been doing any events this year. All events postponed or cancelled, and we have had to refund money, and it has been damaging to the business. You know, we are coming to the crunch point now, yeah, and as we move into January and February, which is a traditionally quiet time of year in our industry, that is where it is going to be really difficult." (Business, LGV, B3: Retail, Outside GM)*

*"COVID-19 has affected all our businesses with the restrictions, and many businesses in our industry will not re-open, I don't think. Reduced turnover, and the changes in the working world because of COVID-19 and businesses we supply to not operating etc. It is a real struggle and will be for a while yet. I'm not sure if we will survive it." (Business, LGV, B5, Night-time Economy, Inside GM)*

Some businesses reported due to Covid-19, they have delayed the purchase of new vehicles, as in the current climate, they feel there is too much of a risk and / or they don't have the money they usually do to buy new vehicles.

*"By now, I would have replaced a couple of my vans during the last few months, but I'm waiting to see what happens as I'm not using them at the moment anyways as there are no events for us to go to. It is too risky, and I don't have the cash flow for it." (Business, B3: Retail, Outside GM)*

One of the businesses reported taking the opportunity of a quieter period to trial an electric van to see how it would fit in with their business and their needs. Whilst they found it a useful experience, it has shown that, for their needs, it is not suitable yet at the level of technology it is at.

*"I actually had an electric van on loan to the business to see whether we liked it or not. It was nice, and I think a lovely van to drive, but it only takes 80 miles before it needs charging again. Most of my general trips are at least 100 miles plus, so yes, it was nice to trial but impractical, especially with no charging points around. It is supposed to self-charge as it was driving, but it only gave you another 15 miles or so. It was a shame, but it is not right yet for us." (Business, B3: Retail, Outside GM)*



Most businesses, even those that have managed to remain busy during this period, are cautious about how they will be able to adapt or respond to the proposals. Some businesses are worried the current climate makes it untenable, even with some level of support from the 10 Local Authorities, to contemplate being able to upgrade to newer vehicles and, therefore, the prospect of a daily charge is a worry for them.

Even though some businesses stated they are doing well during this period in terms of work available to them, they also highlighted they are feeling the consequences elsewhere. As already mentioned, because one business had taken their business online to a larger extent, their postage and courier costs have increased due to the restrictions in place and people not being able to come to the store.

*“We have had to invest in more packing and boxes and trips to the post office, if it was small enough. If not, arranging for couriers to come in and pick it up and find the best price on couriers, so that has been a cost that we have seen increase during this time.” (Business, B3: Retail, Outside GM)*

A construction firm noted that due to social distancing rules, when they would usually send five workmen in one van to a job, they now must “buddy up” the staff into pairs and send three vans to a single job with one or two people in each, thus increasing the costs to complete one job. They also acknowledged the impact sending three vans instead of one has on their carbon footprint.

*“And most of my vans are five-seaters, so before this, I was sending like five lads to a job in one van, but now I’m sending three vans to one job, with five men. Obviously, it’s costing more with everything, because I could send five men to one job in one van, but now I’ve got five men to a job in three vans. We basically would sign a contract to say one of my contracts has got three hundred hours on it, it might last six years, and when you sign it, it says duration of contract, so I can’t recoup those costs.” (Business, LGV / HGV, B4, Agriculture / Construction, Waste Management, Inside GM)*

Some of the businesses stated they are trying to “make it through Covid-19” and, therefore they are not aware of the proposals because they are focused on other things. Now they feel they cannot think about the longer term and how they will respond to the proposals; as one said, “they may not have a business by then”.

*“My main worry is next year, you know, and the fact that with more people working from home, parking and car parks aren’t going to be utilised as much as they were being used, and how that might affect my business” (Business, HGV / LGV, B1: Agriculture, Construction, Outside GM)*

*“I think the big issue is the industry has got no money. We’ve all had nine months, pretty much twelve months without earning any money. Nobody’s going to have the money to invest in vehicles next year. Nobody’s investing this year, so everybody’s a year behind where they were. There’s not going to be the money next year, because we’re not going to be as busy.” (Business, Minibus / Coach, B2, Outside GM)*

Others were worried the knock-on effects of Covid-19 will be seen in their financial credit ratings for any future borrowing they consider.

*“The thing to consider also is with the current COVID situation, everyone’s credit ratings will be getting downgraded anyway, because of, you know, there’s a lot of hesitancy out there for people to lend, isn’t there, at the moment. So, even if you know, twelve months, two years, you could have got the credit, maybe you might be downgraded 10% or something, you know, 50%, you don’t know until you need it. But a lot of companies won’t be in the same position now than they were twelve months ago.” (Business, HGV, B7, Manufacturing / HGV transport, Inside GM)*

## Effect of Covid-19 on Air Quality

Many respondents thought restrictions during Covid-19 had affected air pollution in a positive way and referenced examples of why they thought this, highlighting the lack of air traffic and

less vehicles on the road temporarily, as some of the main reasons as to why they felt it had been good for air quality.

*“I did see a lot of things about the fact that, you know, people weren’t really doing very much, and they weren’t going out and, obviously, because of that, that meant that like ... I think I saw like a picture of Venice, that the water was clear for the first time ever or something.” (Public, G10, Female only group, Aged 18-34, Bus / Taxi users, Low income areas, Inside GM)*

*“Well, I mean I go back to the first lockdown as well, I had the good opportunity of going to a top floor, high hotel in Manchester and I could see the difference between the quality of the air, if you know what I mean, you can’t, you can sometimes see a haze over the city, whether that was in the morning or at night, you could certainly see it and during the lockdown even after ten days of the first lockdown, I could certainly see a difference in the air quality. I don’t know what it was like breathing it in, I mean, but it certainly looked cleaner, it certainly looked cleaner and it was basically due to nothing on the roads, absolutely nothing on the roads and nobody in Manchester, really, but I think that was probably the big help, that nobody was travelling into town and nobody was doing anything, so you could see the marked difference, definitely.” (Business, Depth, Plumber, Inside GM)*

## Conclusions

Overall, members of the public were quite positive about improving air quality across the region. However, whilst businesses acknowledged the importance of air quality, it was of less importance to businesses than members of the public.

Both members of the public and business respondents questioned whether the criteria of which vehicles had been defined as compliant by Government and the strategy implemented would succeed in reducing poor air quality in the region. There was a lot of discussion around why private cars had been excluded from the proposals and how successful the CAZ would be without them.

Many respondents suggested members of the public will be negatively affected as the investment costs, or the daily charges will be passed on to the customer. Businesses said they would need to find a way to cover the costs and suggested this would result in an increase in prices / fares. Some businesses suggested it may become part of their job by job costings i.e. if a customer was paying for a service or delivery in GM there would be an automatic surcharge to cover the daily charge the driver / business would receive for entering the CAZ.

Almost all respondents felt support was needed for businesses to be able to afford to upgrade their vehicles in time. However, some businesses did not believe the proposed funding goes far enough as they would need to invest in their vehicles in order to become compliant. Many also felt there are a lot of businesses in the region and the proposed funding pot would not be able to cover everyone eligible for support. Financially, they felt new vehicles is a big investment for a lot of companies and now this is seen as a risk due to economic uncertainty.

One of the key areas of discussion was the lead in time to upgrading vehicles prior to the CAZ being implemented. Many businesses reported they buy their vehicles and plan the investment and payment over 5+ years. Some businesses had only recently bought vehicles in the past 12-18 months that would not be compliant. Some businesses had not been aware of the proposals prior to the focus groups and felt they need more notice to be able respond.

Across all respondents, many raised concerns about the timings, considering the current Covid-19 pandemic. Many respondents stated many businesses are struggling to stay afloat, without the extra pressure of having to find the investment to upgrade to newer vehicles or pay the daily charge once the plan is put into place. A handful of businesses and taxi / PHV drivers suggested the proposals could be the final straw for them in what has been a difficult 12 months and it may cause them to close their business and / or retire.

## Appendix E Organisations, Elected representatives and Businesses who responded

### Organisations:

The list of organisations that responded to the consultation are shown below. An additional 11 organisations responded, but did not provide their name and one wrote on behalf of a school, but did not state they were authorised to do so.

2nd Cheadle Scout Group	Fightback4justice
Altrincham and Bowdon civic society	Friends of Carrington Moss
Asthma UK and British Lung Foundation Partnership	Friends of the Earth England, Wales and Northern Ireland
Both St Barnabas Church and Waterhead Church, Oldham	Friends of the Trans Pennine Trail
British Horse Society Regional Bridleways Officer for NW	Friends of Victoria Park, Stretford
Burnley Bridleways Association	Federation of Small Businesses
BVRLA	Greater Manchester Shared Services
Chamber of Commerce	Green Groups
Cheshire East Council	High Peak Borough Council
Chorlton Health Centre	Kickstart Social Enterprise
Client Earth	Lancashire Mounted Games Association
Communication Workers Union	Lancashire County Council
Community Transport Association	Levenshulme Clean Air Community Group
Corrie Primary and Nursery School	Liverpool City Region Combined Authority
CPT UK	Manchester Arts Sustainability Team
CSPHA	Manchester City of Trees
East Durham Community Transport Ltd	Manchester Friends of the Earth
Farnworth Baptist Church	Manchester University NHS Trust
Federation of British Historic Vehicle Clubs Ltd.	MESS (Marple Energy Saving Strategy)



Military Vehicle Trust	The British Horse Society
Museum of Transport, Greater Manchester	The Builders Merchants' Federation Ltd (BMF)
National Association of Road Transport Museums	The Christie NHS Foundation Trust
National Physical Laboratory	The Hackney Drivers Association Ltd
National Private Hire and Taxi Association (NPHTA)	The Northern Care Alliance NHS Group
NFU	The Old Courts Wigan
Northern Liaison Group (British Riding Clubs)	The River Manchester
Our Sale West Big Local	The University of Manchester
p.h.d.a limited bury	Trans Pennine Trail Partnership
Pole Moor Riding Club	Transport for Sick Children
Road Haulage Association	Unite the Union (Manchester Hackney Carriage)
Rochdale and Bury Bridleways Association	University of Manchester PGCE Secondary Programme
St Helens Council	Walk Ride Heatons
Steady State Manchester	Wesley Community Furniture
Stockport Youth Council	Whalley Range Climate Action Group
Tameside Owners & Drivers Association	Withington Civic Society
Taxi Trade Organisation / Committee / Representatives with over 100 members	

## Councillors and Elected Officials

The list of Councillors and Elected Officials who responded to the consultation and the areas they represent are shown below. Five responses were provided without a name or area.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Area represented</b>
John Mullen	Barton
Adele Warren	Brightmet
Martin Hayes	Elton Ward Bury MBC
Charlotte Morris	Elton, Bury
Bob Allen	Heaton & Lostock, Bolton
John Taylor	Heatons North, Stockport
Marie Brady	Horwich North East
Arnie Saunders	Kersal Salford City Council
Dane Anderton	Leigh West
Peter N Roberts	Limestone Peak
Janet Emsley	Littleborough Lakeside, Rochdale
Mandie Shilton Godwin	Manchester
Charlie Stewart	Manor, Stockport
Stephen Homer	Mossley, Tameside
Christopher Evans	North west union officer
A R Khayal	Oldham
Chris Gloster	Oldham
Councillor Flores	Oldham
Jim McMahon OBE MP	Oldham West and Royton
Jon-Connor Lyons	Piccadilly
Haf Barlow (on behalf of the council)	Poynton Council
Kieran Heakin	Rochdale Healey Ward
Steve Hewitt	Saddleworth west and lees
Councillor Driver	Stockport
Matt Wynne	Stockport
Name not provided	Stockport
Stephen Adshead	Stretford, Trafford
Jim Cammell	Swinton South
Brenda Warrington	Tameside
Philip Fitzpatrick	Tameside

Janet Cooper

Rt. Hon. Esther McVey

Ben Hartley

Mike Cordingley

Councillor Watters

Joanne Marshall

Robin Garrido

Tameside- Longdendale

Tatton

Trafford

Trafford

Westhoughton South

Wigan

Worsley Salford

## Business and private hire operators

A list of large businesses and private hire operators who responded to the consultation are shown below. A full list of the businesses and private hire operators who responded to the consultation, and confirmed they were authorised to respond as such, can be found here:

<https://cleanairgm.com/technical-documents/>

A W & D Hammond Ltd	MediaCom North Group
Acklams Coaches Limited	Megabus (Stagecoach)
Arriva North West & Wales	Music Magpie
Birchall Foodservice	NG Transport Ltd
Capita / Network Rail	OneBus
CEMEX	P F Jones
Crystal vehicle rental services	Polyflor Ltd
David Bratt & Sons (Haulage)Ltd	Post Office
Double Time Distribution Ltd.	RAC Motoring Services
Eddie Stobart Logistics Ltd	Roy Braidwood & Sons Transport Ltd
Enterprise Holdings	Royal Mail
Frank O'gara and Sons	Sebden Steel Service Centres Ltd
Frederic Robinson Ltd	SPizarnia UK Ltd
G C Birchall Ltd	Stagecoach Manchester
Go North West Limited	Tamar Coaches & Tours
Greystone Financial Services Ltd	Tarmac
H.G. Stephenson Ltd	Transdev
High Peak Buses	Transport Service Solutions
Holmeswood Coaches Ltd	Uber
Home Instead Senior Care (bury)	UPS UK
John Macadam and Son	V A Whitley & Co. Ltd
Kenny Waste Management	Vic Young (South Shields) Ltd
Law Distribution Ltd	W Harrison & Sons (Carriers) Ltd
Lets Travel	W. Howard Limited
London EV Company	Wallwork Heat Treatment Ltd
M&I Materials Ltd	Warrington's Own Buses
Manchester Airports Group	Zeneth

## Appendix F Coding of comments

Each question was coded by themes which emerged from the comments received. The following tables were used for analysis.

Where responses were provided in one question that had relevant themes for another question these codes were moved to the relevant question.

**The proposed Clean Air Zone boundary would follow the existing administrative boundary of Greater Manchester as closely as possible. Do you have any comments on this?**

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Zone / boundary / areas covered is fair / appropriate / reasonable	323	28	19	24	342
Concerns about redistributing traffic/congestion/air quality problems to surrounding areas (outside boundary)	79	8	7	31	57
Will negatively impact people living on the GM boundary	91	23	5	85	30
Should be different boundaries for different vehicles	21	1	0	16	6
Will negatively impact people travelling to and from Manchester Airport	3	2	1	1	4
City centre should be a ULEZ	483	2	1	2	1
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	46	9	0	17	38
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - boundary	37	7	0	11	33
Should make the zone larger (UK wide / national scale)	29	8	3	7	23
Should include specific roads / areas	25	1	3	1	25
Should include the Motorway/Strategic Road Network	56	5	4	9	50
Should exclude specific roads / areas	23	4	1	12	15
Boundary should focus on city centre only / M60 boundary	122	51	3	99	74
Zone / areas covered is too big	171	90	7	148	117
Zone / areas covered should just be those with poor air quality/city centre and towns / high-risk areas	67	26	9	35	59
Make zone wider NW / general	46	7	0	9	33
Other	36	9	4	8	38
<b>Base</b>	<b>1388</b>	<b>205</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>355</b>	<b>776</b>

**The Clean Air Zone would operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, signage would be used to clearly identify the Clean Air Zone, and the daily charges would apply from midnight to midnight. Do you have any comments on these proposals?**

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Oppose the proposed operation times	125	31	2	63	95
Support the proposed operation times	856	16	21	19	387
Concerns about signage / need to provide clear / easily visible signs	93	13	1	17	89
Concerns / doubts about the implementation/enforcement of the clean air zone	62	10	2	13	56
Should only be charged once within a 24-hour period	31	7	0	15	23
Suggest the time between 24-hour periods should be different / midnight should not be the end / start between 24-hour period	8	1	1	2	6
Unfair to those who do not spend long travelling within the boundary / travel a short distance	2	1	0	1	2
Do not charge for evening / night journeys / only charge in daytime	105	22	5	49	82
Do not charge for weekend travel	44	13	2	39	19
Change the hours of operation to peak times / hours only	66	27	5	45	50
Queries - general	7	5	0	7	5
Other	35	4	5	13	31
<b>Base</b>	<b>1332</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>766</b>

## Do you have any comments on the proposed charges?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Oppose the proposed charges / disagree with the charges (e.g. seem unjustified, counterintuitive, won't make a difference)	414	156	7	257	316
Support the proposed charges / they are good/fair	593	4	2	8	105
Charges should be the same amount for all affected vehicle types	14	2	0	4	12
Differences between charge amounts is unfair	10	5	2	5	12
Charges should be based on mileage	21	4	2	13	12
Charge should be higher for travelling during peak times	41	10	0	12	39
Charge only those who travel in / around city centre most frequently	12	5	1	10	7
Charges should be dependent on the size of the vehicle	12	2	0	4	10
Charges should be dependent on the emissions of the vehicle	61	8	2	12	58
Suggest that the charges should be paid for weekly / monthly / annual periods rather than daily	17	3	1	8	13
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	44	6	3	22	31
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - charges	85	18	4	31	73
Charges are too high / should be lower (general)	258	112	2	190	182
Charges are too high / should be lower for - buses	75	17	3	19	73
Charges are too high / should be lower for - coaches	28	9	0	10	26
Charges are too high / should be lower for - HGVs	14	14	3	13	14
Charges are too high / should be lower for - vans / LGVs	21	18	1	24	14
Charges are too high / should be lower for - minibuses	11	2	0	3	10
Charges are too high / should be lower for - hackney carriages	26	14	1	12	27



## Do you have any comments on the proposed charges? (cont.)

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Charges are too high / should be lower for - private hire vehicles	22	18	0	14	25
Charges are too high / should be lower for - private leisure vehicles	57	2	3	54	4
Charges are too low / should be higher (general)	84	7	3	7	86
Charges are too low / should be higher for - buses	13	2	1	4	12
Charges are too low / should be higher for - HGVs	27	1	1	1	28
Charges are too low / should be higher for - vans / LGVs	14	1	1	0	16
Charges are too low / should be higher for - Hackney carriages	43	2	0	3	42
Charges are too low / should be higher for - private hire vehicles	42	1	1	1	43
Charges are too low / should be higher for other vehicle types	21	1	0	2	20
Other	75	13	8	22	65
<b>Base</b>	<b>1722</b>	<b>344</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>568</b>	<b>1024</b>

### To what extent do you agree or disagree with the permanent local exemptions? Why do you say this?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Support / agree with the permanent local exemptions / they are fair	951	169	34	296	852
Permanent local exemptions are not needed / should have upgraded already	23	1	0	6	17
Disagree with the permanent exemptions (general)	264	66	5	99	235
Proposed permanent exemptions are unfair / more vehicles should be temporarily exempt (general)	28	6	3	17	17
Concern about enforcement of permanent exemptions / ensuring they are not abused	108	4	4	12	102
Exemptions should be temporary	40	4	0	4	40
Permanent exemptions should be regularly reviewed	13	0	2	1	14
Should be permanently exempt - buses	84	10	1	21	74
Should be permanently exempt - taxis	51	51	9	57	53
Should be permanently exempt - vehicles used by disabled / vulnerable users	148	36	6	57	132
Should be permanently exempt - specialist vehicles (e.g. adapted vehicles that would be difficult / impractical to upgrade)	18	17	8	22	9
Should be permanently exempt - private leisure vehicles (e.g. horsebox, motorhome)	234	17	13	202	40
Should be permanently exempt - business vehicles	34	17	5	31	24
Should be permanently exempt - businesses with multiple vehicles should have at least one permanently exempt	1	3	0	4	0
GM residents should be permanently exempt	34	8	1	26	16

### To what extent do you agree or disagree with the permanent local exemptions? Why do you say this? (cont.)

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Should NOT be permanently exempt - disabled passenger vehicles	104	17	2	26	96
Should NOT be permanently exempt - emergency service vehicles	3	0	0	2	1
Should NOT be permanently exempt - specialist vehicles (e.g. adapted vehicles)	29	3	1	6	27
Should NOT be permanently exempt - driving within the zone due to a road diversion	40	2	3	3	42
Motorway diversions are hard to manage	30	1	1	3	29
Major roads should be permanently exempt	2	1	0	3	0
Prolonged / long-term diversions should not be permanently exempt / should be temporary	5	0	0	0	5
SHOULD LGV and HGV	16	8	2	17	9
SHOULD NOT Historic and military	23	1	1	4	21
SHOULD NOT Community minibuses and non-road going vehicles	8	1	0	0	9
Permanent Exempt coach and minibus	12	2	1	4	10
Queries - general	129	25	5	53	102
Other	45	7	6	15	35
<b>Base</b>	<b>1749</b>	<b>343</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>648</b>	<b>1479</b>

### To what extent do you agree or disagree with the temporary local exemptions? Why do you say this?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Support / agree with the temporary local exemptions / they are fair	774	155	28	243	710
Enough time to upgrade to compliant vehicles	67	5	2	12	62
Two years is not enough for the temporary exemption / need longer	226	92	10	151	175
Temporary local exemptions are not needed / should have upgraded already	41	4	1	6	40
Disagree with the temporary exemptions (general)	122	18	7	31	116
Temporary local exemptions will not help / will not be able to afford to upgrade even if given more time	20	12	1	23	10
Proposed temporary exemptions are unfair / more vehicles should be temporarily exempt (general)	11	2	1	8	5
Should be temporary for vehicles until they are due for an upgrade	57	32	4	36	53
Concern about enforcement / ensuring they are not abused	23	0	1	4	20
Temporary exemptions should be regularly reviewed	3	0	0	0	3
Vehicles should be temporarily exempt until Covid-19 has passed	4	4	0	5	3
Temporary exemptions should be shorter	169	8	4	3	178
Incentivise behaviour change / need more incentives for upgrades	221	6	3	11	43
Should NOT be temporarily exempt - vans / LGVs	14	0	2	0	15
Should be temporarily exempt - private leisure vehicles (e.g. horsebox)	11	1	1	7	6
Should be temporarily exempt - HGVs	3	5	0	5	3
Bus coach and minibus	1	3	0	1	2
Should not be temporarily exempt - taxi	18	3	1	5	17
Should be exempt - taxis	11	5	4	5	15
Should be exempt - specialist all	15	3	1	5	12
Queries - general	32	3	0	13	22
Other	11	6	0	5	12
<b>Base</b>	<b>1537</b>	<b>304</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>1240</b>

### To what extent do you agree or disagree with the permanent local discounts? Why do you say this?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Support / agree with the permanent local discounts / they are fair / helpful	333	60	18	122	286
They are not needed / should have upgraded already / should have to pay	377	52	7	61	375
Leisure vehicles over 3.5 tonnes should not be offered discounts	39	4	2	8	37
Private hire vehicles should not be offered discounts	86	13	3	27	75
Discounts should depend on vehicle age / pollution it causes	6	0	0	2	4
Concerns that the discounts will result in people not upgrading	62	2	2	2	64
Concerns about discounts being abused / how these will be enforced	124	11	4	14	123
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	21	2	0	8	15
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - discounts	44	6	2	15	37
Discounts should be higher (general)	12	1	0	7	6
Discounts should be higher for - leisure vehicles over 3.5 tonnes	4	1	2	3	2
Discounts should be higher for - private hire vehicles	2	1	1	2	2
Discounts should be lower (general)	2	0	0	0	2
Discounts should be lower for - leisure vehicles over 3.5 tonnes	2	0	0	1	1
Discounts should be lower for - private hire vehicles	1	1	0	0	2
Discounts should be higher due to / until through the Covid-19 pandemic	1	0	0	0	1
Discounts should be offered for - more vehicles / affected people (general)	14	3	0	8	8
Discounts should be offered for - Hackney carriages	6	20	3	17	12
Discounts should be offered for - leisure vehicles under 3.5 tonnes	27	1	0	21	6
Discounts should be offered for - business vehicles	7	1	0	4	4
Discounts should be offered for - those who are located outside of Greater Manchester but operate within the region	29	5	3	19	12
Bus coach and minibus	7	1	1	3	6
Other	27	1	2	3	26
<b>Base</b>	<b>1115</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>1005</b>

### Do you have any comments on the proposed Clean Bus Fund?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Funding should available to all vehicle types / fair to all (general comments)	107	49	4	73	87
Support the proposed funding / funding is important / needed to be able to conform/upgrade	609	54	18	72	431
Concerns / queries about where funding is coming from for this/transparency over funds	32	5	0	5	32
Funding should be provided as a repayable loan / not given as a grant	16	0	0	2	14
Don't agree with fund because don't agree with charges	1	0	0	0	1
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - funding amount/provision/conditions	37	16	3	20	36
Funding amount is too high / too much funding	16	4	4	3	21
Funding should not be available / not needed – should have already upgraded by now / use own money	228	37	9	61	213
Funding does not consider insurance, maintenance, other fees etc	1	0	0	0	1
Funding should only be for sole traders / smaller companies	21	11	3	14	21
Funding should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	64	11	2	9	66
Concerns about performance of electric buses	4	0	0	0	4
Concerns about availability of electric charging infrastructure / need more charging points	6	1	0	2	5
Other	70	15	3	17	71
All bus companies / operators that operate / travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible	42	32	2	36	37
Should be given more funding	58	40	3	41	58
Payment of funds	12	2	2	2	14
Queries other	57	16	1	28	44
<b>Base</b>	<b>1205</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>979</b>

### Do you have any comments about the proposed management of the funds?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Support the proposed management of funding / eligibility criteria	50	17	4	15	56
Concerns about the funding being mis-managed / needs to be a transparent process	96	22	5	33	89
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	23	11	0	13	21
Funds should be prioritised for older vehicles / most polluting / where change will have greatest impact	264	39	14	46	270
Funds should be prioritised for those who upgrade to electric / hybrid	10	2	1	1	12
Funds should be prioritised for sole traders/small businesses / small organisations	37	19	2	21	37
Funds should be prioritised for voluntary / community organisations / charities / services	11	0	2	1	12
Prioritisation of funding should depend on impact of proposals on the business / organisation	10	3	2	2	12
Concerns about larger companies accounting for / receiving the majority of the funds available	28	11	1	13	26
Funds should be prioritised for those who have already recently upgraded their vehicle/s / should be reimbursed	9	1	0	1	9
Funds should be prioritised for buses / vehicles carrying most passengers	14	1	0	2	13
Needs to be well-advertised / promoted to ensure all those affected are aware and know how to apply for funding	4	4	0	5	3
Concerns about people claiming for funding when not needed / trying to commit fraud / abuse the scheme	65	11	1	17	60
Funding should go to those who need it most / should be means tested	40	6	4	12	38
Concerns that they may not be able to apply immediately / missing the opportunity	2	3	0	3	1
Should be first-come-first serve	2	1	1	1	3
Older vehicles are not necessarily the most polluting / should not focus on oldest vehicles	37	6	2	6	39
Other	54	15	1	22	48
<b>Base</b>	<b>577</b>	<b>124</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>565</b>

### Do you have any comments on the proposed Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Funding should available to all vehicle types / fair to all (general comments)	60	23	3	39	47
Support the proposed funding / funding is important/needed to be able to conform/upgrade	544	67	22	93	365
Concerns / queries about where funding is coming from for this / transparency over funds	32	8	1	9	32
Funding should not come in the form of a repayable loan / should be given as a lump sum grant	9	9	1	12	7
Funding should be provided as a repayable loan / not given as a grant	13	1	0	1	13
Would like there to be more consultation / communication with those affected with these vehicle types	5	1	1	2	5
Funding needed for / concerns about funding for personal leisure vehicles e.g. campervans, horseboxes etc	74	3	4	76	5
Funding / financial support will not help / work (e.g. will not help in the long-term)	34	25	0	39	20
Don't agree with fund because don't agree with charges	6	0	0	0	6
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	147	118	6	176	93
Funding should be higher for vehicles / provide a higher amount to those affected (general)	98	111	6	135	79
Funding amount is too high / too much funding (general)	3	0	0	0	3
Funding should not be available / not needed – should have already upgraded by now / use own money (general)	68	1	3	11	61
Funding does not consider insurance, maintenance, other fees etc	0	4	0	3	1
Unfair funding differences between these affected vehicle types	0	3	0	2	1



**Do you have any comments on the proposed Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund? Cont.**

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Funding should be higher for vehicles / provide a higher amount for - coaches	3	0	0	1	2
Funding should be higher for vehicles / provide a higher amount for - minibuses	1	0	0	0	1
Funding should be higher for vehicles / provide a higher amount for - HGVs	3	4	0	4	3
Funding should be higher for vehicles / provide a higher amount for - vans / LGVs	8	10	0	14	4
All those with these vehicle types that operate / travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible	494	8	4	9	10
Unfair to those located outside the boundary/should be funding to those located outside the boundary but operate in Greater Manchester	21	21	1	31	11
Funding should only be for sole traders / smaller companies / organisations	22	5	0	6	21
Funds should only be for voluntary / community organisations / charities/services	52	0	4	3	52
Should be financial support / reimbursement for those who have already recently upgraded their vehicle/s	0	0	0	0	0
Funding should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	13	4	1	1	15
Funding payments should only be paid after new equipment / vehicles have been invested in	0	0	1	0	1
Concerns about performance of electric vehicles	5	4	1	5	3
Concerns about availability of electric charging infrastructure / need more charging points	10	2	0	3	9
Other	48	15	4	17	50
<b>Base</b>	<b>1575</b>	<b>311</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>487</b>	<b>796</b>

## Do you have any comments about the proposed management of the funds?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Support the proposed management of funding / eligibility criteria	57	17	6	22	58
Concerns about the funding being mis-managed / needs to be a transparent process	77	14	2	19	74
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	17	7	0	13	10
Funds should be prioritised for older vehicles / most polluting / where change will have greatest impact	42	13	2	10	46
Funds should be prioritised for those who upgrade to electric / hybrid	3	1	1	0	4
Funds should be prioritised for sole traders /s mall businesses /s mall organisations	163	61	9	79	152
Funds should be prioritised for voluntary / community organisations / charities / services	99	6	5	9	101
Prioritisation of funding should depend on impact of proposals on business / organisation	27	5	3	7	27
Concerns about larger companies accounting for / receiving the majority of the funds available	43	18	1	20	42
Funds should be prioritised for those who have already recently upgraded their vehicle/s / should be reimbursed	5	0	0	0	5
Needs to be well-advertised / promoted to ensure all those affected are aware and know how to apply for funding	10	4	0	7	7
Concerns about people claiming for funding when not needed / trying to commit fraud / abuse the scheme	50	5	2	11	46
Funding should go to those who need it most / should be means tested	51	13	10	19	54
Concerns they may not be able to apply immediately / miss the opportunity	4	2	1	3	4
Depends on how much funding / support is being offered/unclear on proposed funding	1	7	0	8	0
Queries about classification / definition of small businesses	6	2	0	3	5
Proposals do not affect me / my vehicles	8	2	0	7	3
Other	40	7	2	6	43
<b>Base</b>	<b>538</b>	<b>142</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>509</b>

### Do you have any comments on the proposed funds for hackney carriages?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Funding should be available to all vehicle types / fair to all (general)	56	35	1	38	54
Support the proposed funding for Hackney carriages / funding is important / needed to be able to conform/upgrade	458	78	11	82	291
Concerns / queries about where funding is coming from for Hackney carriages / transparency over funds	56	6	2	6	58
Funding for Hackney carriages should not come in the form of a repayable loan / should be given as a lump sum grant	3	10	0	9	4
Funding for Hackney carriages should be provided as a repayable loan / not given as a grant	20	3	1	4	19
Don't agree with fund because don't agree with charges	5	1	0	0	6
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	47	23	4	24	49
Funding should be higher for Hackney carriages / provide a higher amount to those affected	66	101	14	95	86
Funding amount is too high / too much funding for Hackney carriages	8	2	0	2	8
Funding should not be available for Hackney carriages/not needed – should have already upgraded by now / use own money	206	20	5	37	194
All Hackney carriages that operate / travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible	21	25	5	23	26
Funding should only be Hackney carriage sole traders / smaller companies	16	6	0	4	18
Should be financial support / reimbursement for those who have already recently upgraded their Hackney carriages	4	6	2	1	11
Funding for Hackney carriages should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	38	5	1	5	39
Funding payments should only be paid after new equipment / Hackney carriages have been invested in	2	1	1	1	3
Funding should only be available to Hackney carriages that are licensed in Greater Manchester.	23	5	2	7	23
Concerns about performance of electric Hackney carriages	3	6	0	6	3
Concerns about availability of electric charging infrastructure / need more charging points for Hackney carriages	22	7	3	5	26

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Out of scope for proposals – impact / lack of enforcement of Uber	31	10	2	10	33
Other	26	9	3	7	30
<b>Base</b>	<b>947</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>792</b>

### Do you have any comments on the proposed funds for private hire vehicles (e.g. eligibility criteria, funding amounts)?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Funding should be available to all vehicle types / fair to all (general comments)	52	45	2	48	51
Support the proposed funding for private hire vehicles / funding is important / needed to be able to conform / upgrade	258	45	8	45	93
Concerns / queries about where funding is coming from for private hire vehicles / transparency over funds	28	5	2	3	32
Funding for private hire vehicles should not come in the form of a repayable loan / should be given as a lump sum grant	1	7	2	6	4
Funding for private hire vehicles should be provided as a repayable loan / not given as a grant	12	1	0	2	11
Don't agree with fund because don't agree with charges	8	2	0	2	8
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	37	16	3	19	37
Funding should be higher for private hire vehicles / provide a higher amount to those affected	52	68	7	61	63
Funding amount is too high / too much funding for private hire vehicles	20	3	2	6	19
Funding should not be available for private hire vehicles / not needed – should have already upgraded by now / use own money	152	14	3	23	146
All private hire vehicles that operate / travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible	19	19	2	19	20
Funding should only be for private hire vehicle sole traders / smaller companies	7	6	0	6	7
Should be financial support / reimbursement for those who have already recently upgraded their private hire vehicles	3	7	1	3	8
Funding for private hire vehicles should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	22	7	1	7	22
Funding payments should only be paid after new equipment / private hire vehicles have been invested in	0	0	0	0	0
Funding should only be available for private hire vehicles that are licensed in Greater Manchester.	23	8	3	14	20
Concerns about performance of electric private hire vehicles	1	0	0	0	1

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Concerns about availability of electric charging infrastructure / need more charging points	8	2	1	1	9
Out of scope for proposals – impact / lack of enforcement of Uber	19	5	1	2	23
Out of scope for proposals – impact / lack of enforcement of taxis registered outside of Greater Manchester (e.g. in Sefton)	39	11	2	15	37
Other	21	4	0	4	21
<b>Base</b>	<b>658</b>	<b>188</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>202</b>	<b>489</b>

## Do you have any comments on the proposed Vehicle Finance Offer?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Funding / support should be available to all those affected / fair to all (general comments)	29	10	5	21	22
Support the proposed funding / vehicle finance offer/is important / needed	262	89	11	102	258
Oppose the vehicle finance offer / funding / concern about the vehicle finance offer not providing value for money	131	53	4	69	118
Vehicle finance offer will lead to more debt	40	63	1	70	34
Funding / support should not come in the form of a finance contribution or loan / should be given as a lump sum grant	46	32	4	41	41
Finance/loans provided should be affordable /low / zero interest	34	29	4	29	38
Funding / support should not be available/not needed – should have already upgraded by now / use own money	48	1	0	7	42
Concerns / queries about where funding is coming from for this / transparency over funds/support	55	10	1	13	53
Concerns about the Funding / support being mis-managed	71	6	1	7	71
Would like there to be more consultation/communication with those affected about funding	4	2	0	3	3
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	30	37	1	47	21
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - vehicle finance offer / funding amount	33	22	2	30	27
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - eligibility for the vehicle finance offer	17	22	3	26	15
Concerns about people claiming for Funding / support when not needed / trying to commit fraud / abuse the scheme	57	4	2	8	55
Funding / support should go to those who need it most / should be means tested	18	2	3	3	20
Should be financial support / reimbursement for those who have already recently upgraded their vehicle/s	3	7	0	4	6
Funding / support should only be paid after new equipment / vehicles have been invested in	6	2	0	0	8
Concerns that they may not be able to apply immediately / missing the opportunity	1	0	1	1	1

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Needs to be well-advertised / promoted to ensure all those affected are aware and know how to apply for funding	5	1	0	3	3
Funding / support should be prioritised to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	12	1	0	0	13
Funds / support should be prioritised for voluntary / community organisations / charities / services	3	0	1	2	2
Funds/support should be prioritised for older vehicles / most polluting / where change will have greatest impact	5	0	0	1	4
All those that operate / travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible for funding/support	6	5	3	11	0
Other	37	15	4	26	30
<b>Base</b>	<b>849</b>	<b>325</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>423</b>	<b>785</b>



## Why do you say this about a hardship fund?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Funding should available to all those affected/fair to all (general comments)	92	20	1	33	78
Support the proposed funding/funding is important/needed - for affected individuals/businesses /organisations	769	174	37	258	717
Support the proposed funding/funding is important/needed - for me/my business/organisation to survive and continue	11	29	0	36	4
Oppose the hardship funding/it won't help those affected (e.g. will not help long-term)	49	10	1	15	43
Concerns/queries about where funding is coming from for this/transparency over funds	30	0	0	3	27
Concerns about the funding being mis-managed	35	5	1	8	33
Funding should not come in the form of a repayable loan/should be given as a lump sum grant	4	1	0	1	4
Funding should be provided as a repayable loan/not given as a grant	0	1	1	1	1
Funding is needed/important to ensure social equality	85	11	7	23	80
Don't agree with fund because don't agree with charges	15	4	0	4	15
Queries about the proposals/information not clear - general comments	15	7	1	13	10
Funding should be higher for vehicles/provide a higher amount to those affected	53	30	4	36	51
Funding amount is too high/too much funding	6	1	0	2	5
Funding should not be available/not needed – should have already upgraded by now/use own money	79	6	2	13	74
All those that operate/travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible	14	1	2	6	9
Concerns about people claiming for funding when not needed/trying to commit fraud/abuse the scheme	73	6	3	7	75
Funding should go to those who need it most/should be means tested	33	5	1	7	31
Should be financial support/reimbursement for those who have already recently upgraded their vehicle/s	1	2	0	0	3
Funding should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid/electric vehicles	2	0	1	0	3

Funding payments should only be paid after new equipment/vehicles have been invested in	2	0	0	0	2
Needs to be well-advertised/promoted to ensure all those affected are aware and know how to apply for funding	9	1	1	2	9
Funds should be prioritised for sole traders/small businesses/small organisations	62	9	4	16	58
Funds should be prioritised for voluntary/community organisations/charities/services	21	1	2	5	19
Other	33	10	3	11	35
<b>Base</b>	<b>1266</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>437</b>	<b>1156</b>

### If you are impacted by the proposed clean air zone daily charges, is there any additional support that you would need?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
No additional support needed/funding and financial support offered is good/fair/appropriate	10	11	0	21	0
Queries about the proposals/information not clear - general comments	2	6	2	9	0
More time needed to allow electric vehicle technology for small goods vehicles to become widely available and cheaper	11	4	2	6	9
More time needed to adapt to the proposals	9	19	2	20	6
Support/counselling should be provided to those whose mental health will be impacted by the proposals	5	5	0	9	1
Should be discounted charges for those who travel within the boundary frequently/those who pay in advance	6	6	0	10	2
Funding should be available to all vehicle types/fair to all	5	2	0	5	2
Financial support needed to be able to pay daily charges	16	11	0	20	7
Should be financial support for those relocating outside of Greater Manchester due to the proposals	1	0	0	1	0
Concerns/queries about where funding is coming from for this/transparency over funds	7	1	1	1	7
Funding/financial support should not be available/not needed – should have already upgraded by now/use own money	1	0	0	0	1
More financial support/funding needed to upgrade vehicle/s	83	115	8	164	28
Should be given 100% of total cost/given a compliant vehicle for free	40	34	1	69	6
Should be more financial support/incentives to upgrade to electric/hybrid vehicles	29	3	1	4	28
Funding/financial support should be provided for other costs - insurance, maintenance, other fees etc	1	4	0	3	1
More funding/financial support needed for - sole traders/smaller companies/organisations	20	10	2	12	17
More funding/financial support needed for - voluntary/community organisations/charities/services	4	0	2	5	1

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
All those affected by the proposals should be eligible for funding/financial support	15	15	1	23	5
Needs to be well-advertised/promoted to ensure all those affected are aware and know how to apply for funding/financial	5	1	0	2	4
Concerns about people claiming for funding when not needed/trying to commit fraud/abuse the scheme	1	0	0	0	1
Funding should go to those who need it most/should be means tested	37	15	5	18	36
Concerns about performance/availability of electric vehicles	12	9	3	7	13
Concerns about availability of electric charging infrastructure/need more charging points	71	15	6	14	67
Other	23	34	2	53	4
<b>Base</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>216</b>

### Do you have any other comments on the proposals for the Clean Air Plan as set out in the consultation document?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Oppose the proposals (general comments)	651	223	14	360	515
Air quality / pollution is not an issue in Greater Manchester / proposals not needed	87	58	4	73	76
Should be a vote on the proposals	39	10	0	17	31
There are more important areas to be spending the money on	133	16	1	31	117
Proposals are a stealth tax / congestion charge / money-making scheme / financial scam	607	178	12	279	510
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	27	5	2	7	24
Support the proposals (general comments)	976	40	33	50	318
Proposals should go further (general comments)	894	25	18	24	253
Use the revenue from charges to improve GM / manage back into the economy	63	2	3	6	60
Should be more involvement from those impacted in developing the proposals	26	11	5	12	23
Impact / success of the proposals should be monitored	35	3	1	4	34
Proposals need to be promoted / communicated effectively	57	13	6	15	55
Need other initiatives/measures to improve air quality / environmental impact	469	37	11	75	255
Need better road infrastructure / design / capacity to reduce congestion / improve air quality	222	38	7	63	197
Should be a scrappage scheme for non-compliant vehicles	33	11	13	12	32
Air quality is still an issue from other pollutants	40	6	3	12	36
Put tax / charge on petrol	2	1	0	1	2
More information needed on pollutant reduction	173	0	0	0	0
Delay the proposals / implement at a later date	118	68	12	83	109
Implement the proposals sooner / as soon as possible	797	8	5	11	147
Should include privately cars / motorbikes / mopeds / motorhomes in the proposals	1003	76	25	86	349
Concern about privately owned vehicles being included in the near future	157	8	4	29	138

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Should accept lower standards for vehicles to be compliant	16	23	1	28	11
Businesses in less polluting areas should not be charged for using vehicles	1	0	0	0	1
Restrict / discourage vehicle use (general comments)	271	12	10	9	103
Should pedestrianise / ban cars from the city centre / introduce a congestion charge	95	14	3	20	89
Vehicles should be charged / penalised for idling	68	7	5	12	62
Target / charge school runs	59	4	3	16	41
Older / most polluting vehicles should be targeted/replaced	112	25	1	30	108
Older vehicles / those already due to be upgraded should receive less funding / financial support	22	4	1	6	21
Too many taxis (Hackney and PHV) on the road already / need to reduce the amount of them	43	5	2	6	43
All taxis (Hackney and PHV) should be cleaner / greener (e.g. electric, hybrid, hydrogen)	42	4	0	7	39
Should promote / encourage more use of active travel (general comments)	199	3	9	2	25
Should promote / encourage more use of buses / public transport (general comments)	273	13	11	18	92
Should be higher standards for vehicles to be compliant	292	21	10	17	126
Encourage vehicle sharing	222	7	7	14	42
Improve public transport	499	40	19	87	455
Improve active travel	137	7	10	15	129
Improve cycling	122	5	0	11	113
Other	112	30	19	28	100
<b>Base</b>	<b>2778</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>708</b>	<b>1888</b>

### Taking in to account both the Clean Air Zone and the support offered, what would be the likely impact on you / your business / your organisation?

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Will have a large/significant impact on me/my business/organisation	24	23	0	34	12
Will have a positive impact on me/my business/organisation	1	0	0	0	1
Will have a negative impact on me/my business/organisation	35	52	3	55	33
Will negatively impact mental health/wellbeing (e.g. stress)	52	10	7	47	17
Queries about the proposals/information not clear - general comments	9	14	1	16	8
Concerned about impact on bus/public transport routes/frequency	28	8	3	7	23
Will improve/encourage active travel/public transport use	7	0	0	0	7
Will cause more congestion/encourage more private car use	93	13	3	23	82
Won't improve air pollution/quality	986	70	17	123	294
Support the proposals/scheme and efforts to improve air pollution/encourage behaviour change/reduce congestion	657	22	18	29	494
Will need to replace vehicle/s	22	33	2	46	10
Will need to replace vehicle/s and am prepared to do this	11	8	2	8	11
Will devalue my vehicle/s/will have to sell vehicle/s	61	33	4	78	16
Concerned that the price of compliant vehicles will increase because of the proposals	21	32	4	33	19
Cannot afford to upgrade my vehicle/s	190	203	14	287	115
Unfair to those who have recently bought a vehicle/s/not yet due for upgrade	10	24	4	23	14
Will add costs/negatively impact use of personal leisure vehicle/s/hobbies/clubs/ events	306	7	10	274	32
Concern about goods/services/fares increasing in price for people	741	92	27	164	671
Will impact me financially/add more costs to my life/activities	241	78	2	229	92
Will have a significant/detrimental impact on me financially (e.g. cause bankruptcy, homelessness)	47	65	1	89	21
Unfair impact to those located just outside of Greater Manchester/who don't qualify for funding	6	5	3	8	4

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Will increase my business prices to cover costs/charges	20	61	5	62	16
Will negatively impact businesses/trade/economy in Greater Manchester	529	189	31	335	390
Will negatively impact my business/operations/performance	137	284	17	323	109
Will cause me to close my business/lose my job/some will go out of business	126	209	14	243	95
No or small impact	397	51	11	29	428
Will reduce travel into and within GM	68	8	6	34	39
Will cause relocation	62	25	1	50	36
Other	62	21	3	25	58
<b>Base</b>	<b>2730</b>	<b>597</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>942</b>	<b>1761</b>



**Please use this space to tell us about how the Covid-19 pandemic has affected your ability to meet the proposals outlined within the consultation document:**

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
No impact on my business / businesses	4	30	2	16	18
Increased financial pressures / income has fallen as a result of Covid-19 (general)	281	279	27	308	272
Proposals are unfair as businesses are already struggling due to Covid-19 (general)	228	104	13	134	209
Debt has increased / cannot afford more debt due to Covid-19	5	44	5	44	7
Savings / reserves have been used up/almost exhausted	8	30	7	33	8
Business may close / cease to operate due to Covid-19	24	40	3	40	26
Business is not eligible for financial support being offered by Government to cope with Covid-19	3	21	3	20	5
Brexit is causing issues / uncertainty about business performance	34	13	4	15	32
Cannot afford to upgrade my vehicle/s due to Covid-19	43	95	7	102	35
Staff job losses due to Covid-19	3	14	4	14	3
No impact on me / individuals/people	80	0	0	17	63
Increased financial pressures / costs for me / individuals / people as a result of Covid-19 (general)	261	55	9	121	201
Covid-19 has made it more difficult to use buses / public transport (e.g. reduced services / frequency/routes)	9	2	0	3	7
Covid-19 has/will increase prices of goods / services/fares	3	0	0	0	3
Covid-19 is having a negative impact on those who are poorer / lower income households	7	1	0	3	5
Concerns about losing my job due to Covid-19	1	0	0	0	1
Covid-19 pandemic is temporary/should not affect / delay proposals	174	2	6	9	172
The need for the proposals should be reviewed due to the improvement in air quality as a result of the Covid-19 lockdown	123	28	9	57	95
Covid-19 has highlighted the need / opportunity to reduce pollution / improve air quality	138	2	9	6	132

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Concerns about the availability / accessibility of funding / financial support for proposals as a result of Covid-19	31	2	2	1	33
Impact of Covid-19 needs to be considered when setting eligibility criteria for funding / financial support	36	2	2	5	33
Buses / public transport is being used less due to Covid-19/other forms of transport are important / needed for safety	71	6	4	12	65
Covid-19 highlighted the need for better / upgraded vehicles (general)	1	0	0	0	1
More people will/continue to work from home and reduce air pollution as a result of Covid-19 / change in practices	33	2	3	13	24
Other	151	33	4	32	156
Proposals should be delayed until after the Covid-19 pandemic has passed	213	45	14	90	172
<b>Base</b>	<b>1266</b>	<b>411</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>1128</b>

**Please use this space to provide any comments on the draft Equality Impact Assessment**

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Support / agree with the Equality Impact Assessment - it is fair / appropriate (general)	25	2	4	1	28
Oppose / disagree with the Equality Impact Assessment - it is unfair / not enough	26	10	0	14	22
Should be no protected characteristics / everyone should be treated equally	30	3	1	5	29
Equality Impact Assessment will not make any difference / does not matter	25	3	0	6	22
Should be more consultation / engagement with those affected about the impact and who should be considered	8	4	1	3	10
Feel that more consideration should be given to the impact on community groups (e.g. equine community)	7	0	1	3	1
Support / agree that it is a protected characteristic - sexual orientation	0	0	0	0	0
Should not be a protected characteristic - sexual orientation	3	0	1	2	2
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	0	0	0	0	0
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - EQIA	21	2	0	5	18
Proposals will have a positive impact on – children / young people	11	1	1	0	5
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for – children / young people	10	2	1	1	6
Proposals will have a positive impact on - older people	2	1	0	0	2
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for - older people	9	2	1	1	6
Concern about the impact on transport options for older people (e.g. that the proposals will cause isolation)	9	3	1	7	5
Proposals will have a positive impact on – men / males	6	0	0	0	6
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for – men / males	6	2	0	1	7
Proposals will have a positive impact on – women / females	0	0	0	0	0
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for – women / females	2	0	0	1	1

	General Public	Business	Representatives	Own an impacted vehicle	No impacted vehicle owned
Proposals will have a positive impact on – disabled / vulnerable people / those with health issues	8	0	1	1	7
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for - disabled people	23	3	1	11	16
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for - those with health issues	9	2	2	2	4
Concern about the impact on transport options for disabled (e.g. that the proposals will cause isolation)	35	10	5	17	29
Concern that not all disabilities / health issues will be considered	12	1	1	2	10
Proposals will have a positive impact on – pregnancy / maternity	0	0	0	0	0
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for – pregnancy / maternity	0	0	0	0	0
Proposals will have a positive impact on - certain ethnic / religious groups	0	0	0	0	0
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for - certain ethnic / religious groups	8	8	2	7	11
Concerns that funding / financial support will not be available/suitable to certain ethnic / religious groups	6	0	0	1	5
Proposals will have a positive impact on - poorest/ lowest income households / people	2	0	1	0	2
Proposals will have a negative impact on /should be more consideration for – poorest / lowest income households / people	120	23	8	56	87
Support age and gender	5	0	0	1	4
Support disability and pregnant	10	1	1	4	8
Support ethnicity and religion	4	0	0	0	4
Do not support age and gender	2	0	0	1	1
Do not support disability and pregnant	0	0	0	0	0
Do not support ethnicity and religion	3	0	0	1	2
Other	15	4	0	3	16
<b>Base</b>	<b>346</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>286</b>

**The proposed Clean Air Zone boundary would follow the existing administrative boundary of Greater Manchester as closely as possible. Do you have any comments on this?**

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Zone / boundary / areas covered is fair / appropriate / reasonable	1	1	5	4	16	4	7	1	263	20	78
Concerns about redistributing traffic / congestion / air quality problems to surrounding areas (outside boundary)	1	1	2	15	16	2	1	0	61	8	14
Will negatively impact people living on the GM boundary	1	0	3	38	48	4	3	1	70	12	3
Should be different boundaries for different vehicles	0	1	0	11	2	1	1	0	12	3	0
Will negatively impact people travelling to and from Manchester Airport	1	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0
City centre should be a ULEZ	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	0	0	1	1	9	3	1	2	37	8	5
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - boundary	0	0	0	1	10	2	1	0	35	3	4
Should make the zone larger (UK wide/national scale)	0	0	0	0	5	0	3	1	24	0	2
Should include specific roads / areas	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	22	3	3
Should include the Motorway / Strategic Road Network	0	0	1	0	6	2	1	0	47	6	5
Should exclude specific roads / areas	1	2	0	4	4	3	0	1	19	1	2
Boundary should focus on city centre only / M60 boundary	1	2	4	20	63	9	5	6	116	19	9
Zone / areas covered is too big	4	5	6	27	89	18	5	25	169	21	10
Zone / areas covered should just be those with poor air quality / city centre and towns / high-risk areas	0	2	5	4	26	6	4	2	68	7	4
Make zone wider NW / general	0	0	0	2	6	1	1	1	25	1	10
Other	1	0	1	3	9	2	3	1	31	3	10
<b>Base</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>782</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>134</b>

**The Clean Air Zone would operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week, signage would be used to clearly identify the Clean Air Zone, and the daily charges would apply from midnight to midnight. Do you have any comments on these proposals?**

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Oppose the proposed operation times	5	1	5	14	34	4	4	9	108	14	11
Support the proposed operation times	1	1	5	1	17	3	2	1	287	26	102
Concerns about signage / need to provide clear / easily visible signs	3	2	1	3	14	4	1	1	78	6	18
Concerns / doubts about the implementation / enforcement of the clean air zone	0	0	1	1	10	4	2	1	51	5	9
Should only be charged once within a 24-hour period	1	1	4	4	13	1	2	0	27	2	3
Suggest the time between 24-hour periods should be different / midnight should not be the end / start between 24-hour period	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	6	1	1
Unfair to those who do not spend long travelling within the boundary / travel a short distance	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	1	0
Do not charge for evening / night journeys / only charge in daytime	1	1	6	13	21	5	4	6	91	15	10
Do not charge for weekend travel	1	1	3	19	16	1	4	3	37	5	4
Change the hours of operation to peak times / hours only	0	0	3	12	23	2	9	7	59	8	3
Queries - general	0	2	0	1	1	0	3	1	6	0	0
Other	0	0	1	1	9	3	1	0	30	6	8
<b>Base</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>690</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>159</b>

## Do you have any comments on the proposed charges?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Oppose the proposed charges / disagree with the charges (e.g. seem unjustified / counterintuitive / won't make a difference)	5	5	6	65	147	27	38	29	401	36	24
Support the proposed charges/they are good / fair	1	0	1	3	7	0	0	0	73	3	32
Charges should be the same amount for all affected vehicle types	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	12	0	3
Differences between charge amounts is unfair	0	0	1	1	4	0	1	0	12	1	1
Charges should be based on mileage	0	0	0	5	8	0	0	1	18	2	1
Charge should be higher for travelling during peak times	0	0	1	4	11	2	1	1	39	1	4
Charge only those who travel in / around city centre most frequently	0	0	0	3	8	2	0	0	14	1	0
Charges should be dependent on the size of the vehicle	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	11	0	0
Charges should be dependent on the emissions of the vehicle	0	0	2	1	9	2	2	0	54	4	6
Suggest that the charges should be paid for weekly / monthly / annual periods rather than daily	0	0	0	2	5	3	0	1	16	3	1
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	2	1	2	5	6	1	4	2	34	9	2
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - charges	3	2	3	8	14	5	4	2	74	13	10
Charges are too high / should be lower (general)	0	0	4	53	95	21	34	21	242	24	18
Charges are too high / should be lower for - buses	4	8	2	3	10	1	3	1	66	5	14
Charges are too high / should be lower for - coaches	4	7	1	2	6	0	3	0	27	1	3
Charges are too high / should be lower for - HGVs	0	1	0	3	6	7	1	0	21	1	2
Charges are too high / should be lower for - vans / LGVs	0	0	0	0	22	1	1	0	30	0	2
Charges are too high / should be lower for - minibuses	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	11	0	1
Charges are too high / should be lower for - Hackney carriages	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	8	25	1	1

## Do you have any comments on the proposed charges? (cont.)

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage
Charges are too high / should be lower for - private hire vehicles	1	0	0	2	2	0	9	3
Charges are too high / should be lower for - private leisure vehicles	3	0	0	40	13	1	1	0
Charges are too low / should be higher (general)	1	0	0	1	4	1	2	1
Charges are too low / should be higher for - buses	1	1	0	1	3	0	0	0
Charges are too low / should be higher for - HGVs	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Charges are too low / should be higher for - vans / LGVs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Charges are too low / should be higher for - Hackney carriages	1	1	0	1	4	0	0	0
Charges are too low / should be higher for - private hire vehicles	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0
Charges are too low / should be higher for - other vehicle types	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
Other	1	0	0	9	12	4	1	3
<b>Base</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>58</b>



### To what extent do you agree or disagree with the permanent local exemptions? Why do you say this?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Support / agree with the permanent local exemptions / they are fair	12	7	14	70	162	41	29	31	831	89	128
Permanent local exemptions are not needed / should have upgraded already	0	0	0	3	3	0	1	0	19	1	1
Disagree with the permanent exemptions (general)	9	6	1	26	51	11	18	8	218	14	47
Proposed permanent exemptions are unfair / more vehicles should be temporarily exempt (general)	2	1	1	5	9	2	0	1	22	2	3
Concern about enforcement of permanent exemptions / ensuring they are not abused	1	1	1	3	6	0	4	0	96	6	12
Exemptions should be temporary	1	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	31	3	10
Permanent exemptions should be regularly reviewed	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	12	2	3
Should be permanently exempt - buses	3	1	1	7	10	1	4	3	69	8	9
Should be permanently exempt - taxis	0	0	3	4	7	2	22	32	54	4	5
Should be permanently exempt - vehicles used by disabled / vulnerable users	1	2	1	12	28	4	8	15	120	11	24
Should be permanently exempt - specialist vehicles (e.g. adapted vehicles that would be difficult / impractical to upgrade)	4	0	1	6	12	6	0	1	17	6	2
Should be permanently exempt - private leisure vehicles (e.g. horsebox, motorhome)	2	1	0	116	80	11	2	3	132	29	4
Should be permanently exempt - business vehicles	2	1	3	3	23	2	2	1	36	3	4
Should be permanently exempt - businesses with multiple vehicles should have at least one permanently exempt	1	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0
GM residents should be permanently exempt	2	1	1	4	21	0	1	0	24	4	4

### To what extent do you agree or disagree with the permanent local exemptions? Why do you say this? (cont.)

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Should NOT be permanently exempt - disabled passenger vehicles	3	1	3	6	21	4	0	2	98	7	16
Should NOT be permanently exempt - emergency service vehicles	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
Should NOT be permanently exempt - specialist vehicles (e.g. adapted vehicles)	0	0	0	3	3	2	0	0	24	1	6
Should NOT be permanently exempt - driving within the zone due to a road diversion	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	33	3	11
Motorway diversions are hard to manage	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	25	4	5
Major roads should be permanently exempt	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	0
Prolonged / long-term diversions should not be permanently exempt / should be temporary	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1
SHOULD LGV and HGV	0	0	0	6	11	4	3	0	16	2	0
SHOULD NOT Historic and military	0	0	0	1	4	0	1	0	15	1	7
SHOULD NOT Community minibuses and non-road going vehicles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	1
Permanent Exempt coach and minibus	1	1	1	1	2	0	1	0	10	1	1
Queries - general	2	1	5	11	36	10	3	3	103	20	23
Other	1	0	1	7	5	1	1	5	32	5	6
<b>Base</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>329</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>1477</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>235</b>

### To what extent do you agree or disagree with the temporary local exemptions? Why do you say this?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Support / agree with the temporary local exemptions / they are fair	13	8	12	50	148	36	31	21	686	58	107
Enough time to upgrade to compliant vehicles	0	0	1	3	8	2	0	1	53	5	15
Two years is not enough for the temporary exemption / need longer	3	3	7	24	84	15	16	26	215	21	20
Temporary local exemptions are not needed/should have upgraded already	0	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	28	1	14
Disagree with the temporary exemptions (general)	0	1	1	7	15	6	3	6	103	12	22
Temporary local exemptions will not help / will not be able to afford to upgrade even if given more time	0	0	0	8	13	0	1	3	15	0	4
Proposed temporary exemptions are unfair / more vehicles should be temporarily exempt (general)	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	10	2	1
Should be temporary for vehicles until they are due for an upgrade	0	0	0	3	21	4	4	14	56	6	6
Concern about enforcement / ensuring they are not abused	1	1	2	1	2	0	1	0	14	2	8
Temporary exemptions should be regularly reviewed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
Vehicles should be temporarily exempt until Covid-19 has passed	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	3	3	0	0
Temporary exemptions should be shorter	2	1	0	0	4	0	1	0	140	8	38
Incentivise behaviour change / need more incentives for upgrades	0	0	0	2	12	3	0	0	45	3	5
Should NOT be temporarily exempt - vans / LGVs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	0	4
Should be temporarily exempt - private leisure vehicles	0	0	0	5	2	2	0	0	9	2	2
Should be temporarily exempt - HGVs	0	0	0	1	4	6	0	0	6	0	0
Bus coach and minibus	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	0	0
Should not be temporarily exempt taxis	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	1	15	0	4
Should be exempt taxis	0	0	1	1	2	0	3	3	15	0	2
Should be exempt specialist all	1	0	0	1	3	2	2	0	10	2	3
Queries - general	1	1	0	6	7	0	0	0	26	2	4
Other	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	2	13	2	0
<b>Base</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>268</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>1209</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>199</b>

### To what extent do you agree or disagree with the permanent local discounts? Why do you say this?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Support / agree with the permanent local discounts / they are fair / helpful	3	1	4	51	49	9	32	7	270	27	49
They are not needed / should have upgraded already / should have to pay	4	5	2	7	48	16	5	5	315	17	81
Leisure vehicles over 3.5 tonnes should not be offered discounts	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	32	2	11
Private hire vehicles should not be offered discounts	0	1	1	5	23	4	0	1	70	6	15
Discounts should depend on vehicle age / pollution it causes	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	5	0	1
Concerns that the discounts will result in people not upgrading	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	48	4	16
Concerns about discounts being abused / how these will be enforced	0	0	1	1	7	2	1	3	111	7	20
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	13	3	5
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - discounts	1	1	0	5	11	2	0	0	40	3	4
Discounts should be higher (general)	0	0	0	5	1	0	1	0	9	2	0
Discounts should be higher for leisure vehicles over 3.5 tonnes	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	3	1	0
Discounts should be higher for private hire vehicles	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0
Discounts should be lower (general)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Discounts should be lower for leisure vehicles over 3.5 tonnes	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Discounts should be lower for private hire vehicles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Discounts should be higher due to / until through the Covid-19 pandemic	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Discounts should be offered for more vehicles / affected people (general)	1	0	0	6	4	1	2	0	12	3	0
Discounts should be offered for - Hackney carriages	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	19	13	0	3
Discounts should be offered for - leisure vehicles under 3.5 tonnes	0	0	0	6	14	1	0	0	14	6	1
Discounts should be offered for - business vehicles	0	0	0	1	4	1	0	0	6	0	0
Discounts should be offered for - those who are located outside of Greater Manchester but operate within the region	0	0	1	13	7	2	2	0	20	3	2
Bus coach and minibus	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	6	0	1
Other	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	26	1	2
<b>Base</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>929</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>188</b>

## Do you have any comments on the proposed Clean Bus Fund?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Funding should be available to all vehicle types /f air to all (general comments)	0	2	3	18	36	14	16	9	98	14	9
Support the proposed funding / funding is important / needed to be able to conform / upgrade	4	5	3	16	36	5	13	9	375	31	82
Concerns / queries about where funding is coming from for this / transparency over funds	0	0	0	0	5	1	1	0	34	2	0
Funding should be provided as a repayable loan / not given as a grant	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	13	3	1
Don't agree with fund because don't agree with charges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - funding amount / provision / conditions	1	1	3	2	10	3	3	2	41	3	4
Funding amount is too high / too much funding	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	19	0	4
Funding should not be available / not needed – should have already upgraded by now / use own money	3	0	2	9	39	9	7	11	197	14	37
Funding does not consider insurance, maintenance, other fees etc	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Funding should only be for sole traders / smaller companies	1	2	1	2	6	3	6	1	17	1	8
Funding should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	0	0	1	0	6	3	1	0	60	4	11
Concerns about performance of electric buses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0
Concerns about availability of electric charging infrastructure / need more charging points	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	7	0	0
Other	1	1	0	5	4	1	2	4	66	6	9
All bus companies / operators that operate / travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible	4	6	1	7	20	11	6	3	45	5	8
Should be given more funding	2	2	2	0	19	6	10	11	61	3	9
Payment of funds	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	10	3	2
Queries other	2	1	3	6	18	4	3	1	53	8	5
<b>Base</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>927</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>163</b>

### Do you have any comments about the proposed management of the funds?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Support the proposed management of funding / eligibility criteria	1	0	0	2	4	1	7	2	47	3	12
Concerns about the funding being mis-managed/needs to be a transparent process	1	1	1	5	21	4	2	4	90	7	13
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	0	0	0	2	5	0	6	3	18	3	1
Funds should be prioritised for older vehicles / most polluting / where change will have greatest impact	7	5	5	8	32	12	6	5	231	17	50
Funds should be prioritised for those who upgrade to electric / hybrid	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	8	0	5
Funds should be prioritised for sole traders/small businesses organisations	1	1	1	1	13	4	5	2	40	4	6
Funds should be prioritised for voluntary / community organisations / charities / services	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	8	1	3
Prioritisation of funding should depend on impact of proposals on the business / organisation	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	9	0	3
Concerns about larger companies accounting for/receiving the majority of the funds available	3	4	1	0	6	0	4	2	24	2	4
Funds should be prioritised for those who have already recently upgraded their vehicle/s / should be reimbursed	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	8	0	1
Funds should be prioritised for buses / vehicles carrying most passengers	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	10	1	4
Needs to be well-advertised/promoted to ensure all those affected are aware and know how to apply for funding	0	0	0	1	2	1	3	0	2	1	0
Concerns about people claiming for funding when not needed / trying to commit fraud / abuse the scheme	0	0	0	4	11	4	2	1	57	2	12
Funding should go to those who need it most / should be means tested	1	1	1	3	8	1	0	0	35	4	5
Concerns that they may not be able to apply immediately / missing the opportunity	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	1
Should be first-come-first serve	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1
Older vehicles are not necessarily the most polluting / should not focus on oldest vehicles	1	1	3	0	7	2	0	0	40	1	1
Other	3	2	3	4	11	2	4	2	48	3	5
<b>Base</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>518</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>95</b>

### Do you have any comments on the proposed Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Funding should be available to all vehicle types / fair to all (general comments)	1	1	2	10	25	7	5	3	59	2	4
Support the proposed funding / funding is important / needed to be able to conform / upgrade	2	6	9	19	58	16	8	8	334	25	62
Concerns / queries about where funding is coming from for this/transparency over funds	0	0	0	0	7	1	1	0	32	5	2
Funding should not come in the form of a repayable loan / should be given as a lump sum grant	0	0	1	1	9	2	1	0	15	3	0
Funding should be provided as a repayable loan / not given as a grant	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	12	1	1
Would like there to be more consultation / communication with those affected with these vehicle types	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	5	0	1
Funding needed for / concerns about funding for personal leisure vehicles e.g. campervans, horseboxes etc	0	0	0	36	39	3	1	0	41	8	0
Funding / financial support will not help / work (e.g. will not help in the long-term)	0	1	2	2	27	4	5	4	39	3	1
Don't agree with fund because don't agree with charges	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	1
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	2	3	9	23	120	33	9	7	165	24	13
Funding should be higher for vehicles / provide a higher amount to those affected (general)	0	2	4	8	92	22	17	14	123	11	9
Funding amount is too high / too much funding (general)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Funding should not be available / not needed – should have already upgraded by now / use own money (general)	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	1	52	3	14
Funding does not consider insurance, maintenance, other fees etc	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	0	0
Unfair funding differences between these affected vehicle types	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	0	0

## Do you have any comments on the proposed Clean Commercial Vehicle Fund? Cont.

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Funding should be higher for vehicles / provide a higher amount for - coaches	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Funding should be higher for vehicles / provide a higher amount for - minibuses	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Funding should be higher for vehicles / provide a higher amount for - HGVs	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	3	0	0
Funding should be higher for vehicles / provide a higher amount for - vans / LGVs	0	0	1	1	13	1	1	0	11	0	0
All those with these vehicle types that operate / travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible	0	0	0	1	8	2	0	0	11	1	2
Unfair to those located outside the boundary / should be funding to those located outside the boundary but operate in Greater Manchester	1	3	1	5	23	9	2	1	25	1	1
Funding should only be for sole traders / smaller companies/organisations	1	1	0	0	2	1	1	0	18	3	6
Funds should only be for voluntary / community organisations / charities / services	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	43	3	12
Should be financial support / reimbursement for those who have already recently upgraded their vehicle/s	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Funding should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	15	0	1
Funding payments should only be paid after new equipment / vehicles have been invested in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Concerns about performance of electric vehicles	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	1	6	0	0
Concerns about availability of electric charging infrastructure / need more charging points	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	1	10	0	1
Other	1	2	0	1	14	2	2	1	49	5	9
<b>Base</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>884</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>121</b>



## Do you have any comments about the proposed management of the funds?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Support the proposed management of funding / eligibility criteria	0	0	1	3	11	6	2	4	50	6	13
Concerns about the funding being mis-managed/needs to be a transparent process	1	1	0	3	10	2	2	2	79	6	5
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	0	0	0	1	12	1	0	0	15	2	2
Funds should be prioritised for older vehicles / most polluting / where change will have greatest impact	0	0	0	1	9	2	0	0	44	4	6
Funds should be prioritised for those who upgrade to electric / hybrid	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1
Funds should be prioritised for sole traders / small businesses / organisations	1	4	4	13	53	12	10	4	155	15	28
Funds should be prioritised for voluntary / community organisations / charities / services	0	0	1	1	8	1	1	0	85	5	20
Prioritisation of funding should depend on impact of proposals on business / organisation	0	0	0	2	4	3	0	0	25	0	5
Concerns about larger companies accounting for / receiving the majority of the funds available	1	0	2	1	12	3	1	5	41	4	8
Funds should be prioritised for those who have already recently upgraded their vehicle/s / should be reimbursed	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	1
Needs to be well-advertised / promoted to ensure all those affected are aware and know how to apply for funding	0	0	0	0	7	2	1	0	9	0	0
Concerns about people claiming for funding when not needed/trying to commit fraud / abuse the scheme	1	1	2	2	8	2	2	0	43	3	9
Funding should go to those who need it most / should be means tested	2	1	1	2	11	2	2	1	51	5	11
Concerns they may not be able to apply immediately / miss the opportunity	0	0	0	0	3	1	0	0	6	0	0
Depends on how much Funding / support is being offered/unclear on proposed funding	0	0	0	0	4	2	1	1	3	0	0
Queries about classification n/ definition of small businesses	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	6	0	0
Proposals do not affect me / my vehicles	0	0	0	4	4	1	1	0	6	0	1
Other	1	1	0	2	4	1	0	1	38	1	7
<b>Base</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>501</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>87</b>

### Do you have any comments on the proposed funds for hackney carriages?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Funding should be available to all vehicle types / fair to all (general)	0	0	1	3	15	3	13	11	58	6	6
Support the proposed funding for Hackney carriages / funding is important / needed to be able to conform / upgrade	2	3	5	11	19	3	29	34	248	14	51
Concerns / queries about where funding is coming from for Hackney carriages / transparency over funds	0	0	0	1	5	0	1	1	52	3	8
Funding for Hackney carriages should not come in the form of a repayable loan / should be given as a lump sum grant	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	8	3	0	0
Funding for Hackney carriages should be provided as a repayable loan / not given as a grant	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	1	18	0	2
Don't agree with fund because don't agree with charges	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	1	0
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	0	0	1	2	6	1	6	11	42	4	11
Funding should be higher for Hackney carriages / provide a higher amount to those affected	0	0	2	4	12	0	29	65	88	6	10
Funding amount is too high / too much funding for Hackney carriages	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	8	0	1
Funding should not be available for Hackney carriages / not needed – should have already upgraded by now / use own money	2	1	0	11	25	10	1	2	182	10	30
All Hackney carriages that operate / travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible	1	0	1	2	4	1	6	16	19	1	7
Funding should only be Hackney carriage sole traders / smaller companies	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	2	14	2	4
Should be financial support / reimbursement for those who have already recently upgraded their Hackney carriages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	0	0
Funding for Hackney carriages should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	1	1	0	0	5	0	0	1	35	3	6
Funding payments should only be paid after new equipment / Hackney carriages have been invested in	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Funding should only be available to Hackney carriages that are licensed in Greater Manchester.	0	1	1	1	4	0	3	1	21	4	3
Concerns about performance of electric Hackney carriages	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	0

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Concerns about availability of electric charging infrastructure / need more charging points for Hackney carriages	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	24	0	4
Out of scope for proposals – impact / lack of enforcement of Uber	1	0	0	1	2	0	3	6	29	1	8
Other	0	0	1	2	2	0	4	5	26	2	2
<b>Base</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>712</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>122</b>

### Do you have any comments on the proposed funds for private hire vehicles (e.g. eligibility criteria, funding amounts)?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Funding should be available to all vehicle types / fair to all (general comments)	0	0	1	3	16	4	18	15	60	5	3
Support the proposed funding for private hire vehicles / funding is important / needed to be able to conform / upgrade	0	1	3	2	8	0	25	15	76	8	19
Concerns / queries about where funding is coming from for private hire vehicles / transparency over funds	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	28	0	6
Funding for private hire vehicles should not come in the form of a repayable loan / should be given as a lump sum grant	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0
Funding for private hire vehicles should be provided as a repayable loan / not given as a grant	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	11	0	1
Don't agree with fund because don't agree with charges	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	7	1	0
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	0	0	0	1	2	0	15	0	31	2	10
Funding should be higher for private hire vehicles / provide a higher amount to those affected	0	0	4	3	7	0	48	11	64	6	7
Funding amount is too high / too much funding for private hire vehicles	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	3	17	1	3
Funding should not be available for private hire vehicles / not needed – should have already upgraded by now / use own money	3	0	0	7	12	6	1	4	139	9	16
All private hire vehicles that operate / travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible	0	0	1	3	3	1	7	9	15	1	6
Funding should only be for private hire vehicle sole traders / smaller companies	1	1	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	1	2
Should be financial support / reimbursement for those who have already recently upgraded their private hire vehicles	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	5	0	0
Funding for private hire vehicles should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	1	1	1	0	4	1	2	0	22	2	2
Funding payments should only be paid after new equipment / private hire vehicles have been invested in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Funding should only be available for private hire vehicles that are licensed in Greater Manchester.	0	1	1	2	8	0	4	2	26	1	2
Concerns about performance of electric private hire vehicles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Concerns about availability of electric charging infrastructure/need more charging points	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	3
Out of scope for proposals – impact / lack of enforcement of Uber	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	20	1	4
Out of scope for proposals – impact / lack of enforcement of taxis registered outside of Greater Manchester (e.g. in Sefton)	0	0	1	2	8	2	1	3	40	4	5
Other	1	1	2	1	4	0	1	1	21	2	2
<b>Base</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>456</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>73</b>

## Do you have any comments on the proposed Vehicle Finance Offer?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Funding / support should be available to all those affected / fair to all (general comments)	0	0	1	7	9	2	4	2	25	3	4
Support the proposed funding / vehicle finance offer / it is important / needed	1	3	3	16	54	16	25	14	240	19	49
Oppose the vehicle finance offer / funding / concern about the vehicle finance offer not providing value for money	3	0	2	8	43	7	11	10	135	7	11
Vehicle finance offer will lead to more debt	0	0	0	10	25	6	24	21	50	3	3
Funding / support should not come in the form of a finance contribution or loan/should be given as a lump sum grant	2	3	4	6	22	2	8	5	50	7	6
Finance / loans provided should be affordable / low / zero interest	0	0	1	0	8	2	12	12	36	3	3
Funding / support should not be available / not needed – should have already upgraded by now / use own money	1	1	1	1	4	1	0	0	45	2	2
Concerns / queries about where funding is coming from for this / transparency over funds / support	0	0	0	5	3	0	2	4	50	4	8
Concerns about the Funding / support being mis-managed	1	1	1	1	6	2	2	1	62	5	10
Would like there to be more consultation / communication with those affected about funding	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	4	0	0
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	0	1	2	1	32	6	5	6	33	2	5
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - vehicle finance offer/funding amount	0	1	1	4	14	3	8	5	35	3	2
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - eligibility for the vehicle finance offer	0	0	2	0	15	2	4	7	23	6	2
Concerns about people claiming for Funding / support when not needed / trying to commit fraud / abuse the scheme	1	1	1	1	7	1	0	0	50	2	8
Funding / support should go to those who need it most / should be means tested	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	2	13	2	7
Should be financial support / reimbursement for those who have already recently upgraded their vehicle/s	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	5	3	1	1
Funding / support should only be paid after new equipment / vehicles have been invested in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Concerns that they may not be able to apply immediately / missing the opportunity	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	0
Needs to be well-advertised / promoted to ensure all those affected are aware and know how to apply for funding	0	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	5	1	0
Funding / support should be prioritised to upgrade to hybrid / electric vehicles	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	12	2	1
Funds / support should be prioritised for voluntary / community organisations / charities / services	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0
Funds / support should be prioritised for older vehicles / most polluting / where change will have greatest impact	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	1
All those that operate / travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible for funding / support	0	0	0	3	6	3	1	1	5	1	0
Other	0	0	4	8	17	4	2	5	34	4	3
<b>Base</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>228</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>810</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>113</b>

## Why do you say this about a hardship fund?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Funding should available to all those affected/fair to all (general comments)	0	1	2	5	19	4	3	2	85	11	14
Support the proposed funding/funding is important/needed - for affected individuals/businesses /organisations	12	9	12	59	133	25	38	42	675	58	125
Support the proposed funding/funding is important/needed - for me/my business/organisation to survive and continue	0	0	1	4	20	5	5	9	12	1	0
Oppose the hardship funding/it won't help those affected (e.g. will not help long-term)	0	0	0	4	8	6	1	1	45	1	4
Concerns/queries about where funding is coming from for this/transparency over funds	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	26	0	4
Concerns about the funding being mis-managed	0	0	1	1	5	3	0	2	35	3	5
Funding should not come in the form of a repayable loan/should be given as a lump sum grant	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	1	1
Funding should be provided as a repayable loan/not given as a grant	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Funding is needed/important to ensure social equality	0	0	1	11	9	3	1	3	78	9	15
Don't agree with fund because don't agree with charges	0	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	17	1	0
Queries about the proposals/information not clear - general comments	0	0	0	5	7	3	1	1	13	0	2
Funding should be higher for vehicles/provide a higher amount to those affected	0	0	1	3	22	6	3	8	60	3	6
Funding amount is too high/too much funding	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	5	1	1
Funding should not be available/not needed – should have already upgraded by now/use own money	1	1	0	3	9	1	1	1	63	6	13
All those that operate/travel in Greater Manchester and will be affected should be eligible	0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	11	1	1
Concerns about people claiming for funding when not needed/trying to commit fraud/abuse the scheme	0	0	0	1	5	3	0	1	76	5	2
Funding should go to those who need it most/should be means tested	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	2	31	4	4
Should be financial support/reimbursement for those who have already recently upgraded their vehicle/s	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0
Funding should only be provided to upgrade to hybrid/electric vehicles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2



	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Funding payments should only be paid after new equipment/vehicles have been invested in	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0
Needs to be well-advertised/promoted to ensure all those affected are aware and know how to apply for funding	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	9	0	2
Funds should be prioritised for sole traders/small businesses/small organisations	2	2	1	4	12	2	0	0	52	9	10
Funds should be prioritised for voluntary/community organisations/charities/services	1	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	15	1	4
Other	1	1	1	2	5	1	3	2	32	1	8
<b>Base</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>1128</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>187</b>

### If you are impacted by the proposed clean air zone daily charges, is there any additional support that you would need?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
No additional support needed/funding and financial support offered is good/fair/appropriate	2	1	1	4	15	3	1	1	12	2	0
Queries about the proposals/information not clear - general comments	0	0	1	1	5	2	1	1	1	2	0
More time needed to allow electric vehicle technology for small goods vehicles to become widely available and cheaper	0	0	0	1	5	1	0	0	11	0	2
More time needed to adapt to the proposals	1	2	0	4	10	6	1	3	11	2	1
Support/counselling should be provided to those whose mental health will be impacted by the proposals	0	0	0	2	8	0	0	0	7	1	0
Should be discounted charges for those who travel within the boundary frequently/those who pay in advance	0	0	1	1	5	2	4	0	5	1	1
Funding should available to all vehicle types/fair to all	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	0	4	0	0
Financial support needed to be able to pay daily charges	0	0	0	3	13	3	1	2	13	2	3
Should be financial support for those relocating outside of Greater Manchester due to the proposals	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Concerns/queries about where funding is coming from for this/transparency over funds	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	6	1	2
Funding/financial support should not be available/not needed – should have already upgraded by now/use own money	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
More financial support/funding needed to upgrade vehicle/s	1	1	2	28	78	19	24	24	85	15	6
Should be given 100% of total cost/given a compliant vehicle for free	0	0	1	19	36	6	7	4	35	10	0
Should be more financial support/incentives to upgrade to electric/hybrid vehicles	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	1	23	4	6
Funding/financial support should be provided for other costs - insurance, maintenance, other fees etc	1	1	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0
More funding/financial support needed for - sole traders/smaller companies/organisations	0	0	0	0	12	2	0	0	21	4	2
More funding/financial support needed for - voluntary/community organisations/charities/services	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	5	0	0
All those affected by the proposals should be eligible for funding/financial support	3	3	1	5	13	6	0	0	18	2	1

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Needs to be well-advertised/promoted to ensure all those affected are aware and know how to apply for funding/financial	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	5	0	0
Concerns about people claiming for funding when not needed/trying to commit fraud/abuse the scheme	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Funding should go to those who need it most/should be means tested	1	1	1	1	9	5	3	3	34	3	8
Concerns about performance/availability of electric vehicles	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	2	15	1	0
Concerns about availability of electric charging infrastructure/need more charging points	0	0	1	1	10	1	1	3	66	3	8
Other	0	1	1	7	30	10	1	12	28	6	1
<b>Base</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>37</b>

## Do you have any other comments on the proposals for the Clean Air Plan as set out in the consultation document?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Oppose the proposals (general comments)	7	6	9	68	210	36	55	40	612	61	47
Air quality / pollution is not an issue in Greater Manchester / proposals not needed	3	0	2	9	35	5	9	26	96	7	5
Should be a vote on the proposals	0	0	2	1	16	3	1	0	34	7	2
There are more important areas to be spending the money on	1	0	1	9	19	4	1	4	118	11	14
Proposals are a stealth tax / congestion charge/money-making scheme / financial scam	7	4	8	55	169	30	24	39	577	45	44
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	0	0	0	1	4	0	1	1	21	2	6
Support the proposals (general comments)	4	2	3	14	26	9	11	2	261	21	73
Proposals should go further (general comments)	4	1	2	2	16	5	3	1	194	13	65
Use the revenue from charges to improve GM / manage back into the economy	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	52	3	8
Should be more involvement from those impacted in developing the proposals	1	2	1	4	6	5	1	1	21	2	6
Impact / success of the proposals should be monitored	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	29	3	7
Proposals need to be promoted / communicated effectively	0	0	1	3	8	4	3	0	45	6	14
Need other initiatives/measures to improve air quality / environmental impact	2	0	5	22	48	6	5	1	260	18	36
Need better road infrastructure / design / capacity to reduce congestion / improve air quality	2	0	1	9	40	12	6	5	202	18	14
Should be a scrappage scheme for non-compliant vehicles	2	2	2	0	9	3	0	1	38	4	1
Air quality is still an issue from other pollutants	0	1	1	4	9	3	1	0	38	3	4
Put tax / charge on petrol	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
More information needed on pollutant reduction	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Delay the proposals / implement at a later date	1	1	2	11	42	14	11	22	131	7	11
Implement the proposals sooner / as soon as possible	0	0	1	0	8	1	2	0	124	8	27
Should include private cars / motorbikes / mopeds / motorhomes in the proposals	9	6	6	10	52	11	17	12	299	27	76
Concern about privately owned vehicles being included in the near future	0	0	1	8	20	1	0	4	145	4	5

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Should accept lower standards for vehicles to be compliant	2	4	1	5	19	9	3	3	24	1	0
Businesses in less polluting areas should not be charged for using vehicles	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Restrict / discourage vehicle use (general comments)	0	0	2	1	6	2	2	1	78	10	29
Should pedestrianise / ban cars from the city centre / introduce a congestion charge	0	0	0	4	8	2	5	3	70	6	24
Vehicles should be charged / penalised for idling	1	1	2	2	6	2	1	0	55	4	13
Target / charge school runs	0	0	0	7	8	2	0	0	42	4	6
Older/most polluting vehicles should be targeted / replaced	3	2	1	4	18	3	5	4	111	9	8
Older vehicles / those already due to be upgraded should receive less funding / financial support	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	21	2	2
Too many taxis (Hackney and PHV) on the road already / need to reduce the amount of them	0	0	0	2	4	2	0	2	41	2	5
All taxis (Hackney and PHV) should be cleaner / greener (e.g. electric, hybrid, hydrogen)	1	1	0	0	7	0	0	0	35	0	6
Should promote / encourage more use of active travel (general comments)	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	21	5	6
Should promote / encourage more use of buses / public transport (general comments)	2	1	1	6	10	1	1	0	84	7	19
Should be higher standards for vehicles to be compliant	0	0	0	1	14	2	1	0	117	9	18
Encourage vehicle sharing	0	0	1	3	8	2	1	1	42	6	6
Improve public transport	3	3	5	18	63	6	5	4	411	38	82
Improve active travel	0	0	1	4	12	1	1	0	107	13	28
Improve cycling	0	0	1	3	12	1	1	0	92	10	24
Other	1	1	1	6	16	5	2	3	94	6	16
<b>Base</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>1852</b>	<b>162</b>	<b>291</b>

## Taking in to account both the Clean Air Zone and the support offered, what would be the likely impact on you / your business / your organisation?

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Will have a large/significant impact on me/my business/organisation	0	1	0	7	11	6	8	7	25	3	1
Will have a positive impact on me/my business/organisation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Will have a negative impact on me/my business/organisation	1	2	1	8	32	4	19	7	48	8	3
Will negatively impact mental health/wellbeing (e.g. stress)	0	0	1	28	15	4	2	3	39	4	5
Queries about the proposals/information not clear - general comments	0	0	1	0	12	3	2	1	9	2	1
Concerned about impact on bus/public transport routes/frequency	2	0	2	1	3	0	0	1	18	2	8
Will improve/encourage active travel/public transport use	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	0
Will cause more congestion/encourage more private car use	3	1	3	5	15	1	2	0	77	8	16
Won't improve air pollution/quality	3	3	4	28	77	6	12	11	295	25	45
Support the proposals/scheme and efforts to improve air pollution/encourage behaviour change/reduce congestion	2	1	5	2	19	2	8	3	372	30	124
Will need to replace vehicle/s	1	2	1	7	27	15	4	0	29	5	2
Will need to replace vehicle/s and am prepared to do this	0	0	1	0	8	5	0	0	11	1	2
Will devalue my vehicle/s/will have to sell vehicle/s	1	2	1	22	45	7	1	6	46	5	1
Concerned that the price of compliant vehicles will increase because of the proposals	1	1	1	1	23	3	5	6	25	2	4
Cannot afford to upgrade my vehicle/s	3	5	11	48	147	33	53	51	203	22	10
Unfair to those who have recently bought a vehicle/s/not yet due for upgrade	1	0	0	3	14	4	3	10	18	1	1
Will add costs/negatively impact use of personal leisure vehicle/s/hobbies/clubs/events	3	1	3	177	86	11	1	1	159	43	3
Concern about goods/services/fares increasing in price for people	14	7	10	38	104	17	18	6	663	45	80
Will impact me financially/add more costs to my life/activities	1	1	4	76	127	14	14	14	173	28	10
Will have a significant/detrimental impact on me financially (e.g. cause bankruptcy, homelessness)	0	0	1	7	51	6	9	25	50	5	2

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Unfair impact to those located just outside of Greater Manchester/who don't qualify for funding	1	0	1	1	5	2	1	0	8	1	0
Will increase my business prices to cover costs/charges	5	7	4	1	46	15	5	4	46	9	1
Will negatively impact businesses/trade/economy in Greater Manchester	8	8	11	102	172	35	40	36	495	43	32
Will negatively impact my business/operations/performance	11	11	8	26	187	61	62	47	208	25	15
Will cause me to close my business/lose my job/some will go out of business	4	6	4	32	146	44	36	45	182	17	7
No or small impact	0	1	1	6	19	3	12	8	367	26	53
Will reduce travel into and within GM	0	1	0	25	12	3	0	0	53	5	1
Will cause relocation	1	0	3	9	41	8	0	0	61	8	3
Other	1	0	2	5	11	4	6	5	53	5	9
<b>Total</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>502</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>1839</b>	<b>170</b>	<b>261</b>

**Please use this space to tell us about how the Covid-19 pandemic has affected your ability to meet the proposals outlined within the consultation document:**

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
No impact on my business / businesses	3	2	3	1	15	5	2	4	19	2	2
Increased financial pressures / income has fallen as a result of Covid-19 (general)	11	14	12	35	161	46	65	65	330	20	47
Proposals are unfair as businesses are already struggling due to Covid-19 (general)	1	3	4	22	68	17	20	33	232	13	25
Debt has increased / cannot afford more debt due to Covid-19	1	4	3	4	23	4	11	9	21	1	2
Savings / reserves have been used up / almost exhausted	0	1	0	0	17	7	6	5	19	3	4
Business may close / cease to operate due to Covid-19	1	2	1	5	18	2	5	15	34	0	4
Business is not eligible for financial support being offered by Government to cope with Covid-19	0	0	0	2	8	3	4	6	13	2	1
Brexit is causing issues / uncertainty about business performance	2	3	0	1	10	2	3	1	29	3	6
Cannot afford to upgrade my vehicle/s due to Covid-19	2	9	7	9	54	18	24	20	69	6	1
Staff job losses due to Covid-19	1	3	2	1	11	5	0	0	12	3	0
No impact on me / individuals / people	0	0	0	9	7	3	1	0	58	7	8
Increased financial pressures / costs for me / individuals / people as a result of Covid-19 (general)	0	0	5	34	48	9	17	21	218	20	23
Covid-19 has made it more difficult to use buses / public transport (e.g. reduced services / frequency / routes)	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	10	1	0
Covid-19 has / will increase prices of goods / services / fares	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
Covid-19 is having a negative impact on those who are poorer / lower income households	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	7	1	0
Concerns about losing my job due to Covid-19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Covid-19 pandemic is temporary / should not affect / delay proposals	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	137	9	38
The need for the proposals should be reviewed due to the improvement in air quality as a result of the Covid-19 lockdowns	4	2	1	11	30	7	4	11	106	10	10



	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Covid-19 has highlighted the need / opportunity to reduce pollution / improve air quality	0	0	0	2	3	0	1	0	104	7	28
Concerns about the availability / accessibility of funding / financial support for proposals as a result of Covid-19	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	23	0	10
Impact of Covid-19 needs to be considered when setting eligibility criteria for funding / financial support	1	1	1	3	2	1	1	0	30	1	5
Buses / public transport is being used less due to Covid-19 / other forms of transport are important / needed for safety	0	0	1	4	8	0	1	1	59	6	10
Covid-19 highlighted the need for better / upgraded vehicles (general)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
More people will / continue to work from home and reduce air pollution as a result of Covid-19 / change in practices	0	0	0	3	7	2	1	0	23	3	6
Other	2	2	3	13	21	8	6	9	136	12	24
Proposals should be delayed until after the Covid-19 pandemic has passed	3	2	8	19	43	10	9	16	200	16	14
<b>Base</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>305</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>1156</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>172</b>

**Please use this space to provide any comments on the draft Equality Impact Assessment:**

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Support / agree with the Equality Impact Assessment - it is fair / appropriate (general)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	21	0	7
Oppose/disagree with the Equality Impact Assessment - it is unfair / not enough	0	0	1	0	10	2	0	5	23	1	1
Should be no protected characteristics / everyone should be treated equally	1	0	1	1	3	1	1	0	27	2	5
Equality Impact Assessment will not make any difference / does not matter	0	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	22	1	2
Should be more consultation / engagement with those affected about the impact and who should be considered	1	0	1	0	4	0	0	1	6	0	2
Feel that more consideration should be given to the impact on community groups (e.g. equine community)	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	3	0	0
Support / agree that it is a protected characteristic - sexual orientation	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Should not be a protected characteristic - sexual orientation	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	4	0	0
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - general comments	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Queries about the proposals / information not clear - EQIA	0	0	1	0	3	0	1	1	15	2	5
Proposals will have a positive impact on – children / young people	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for – children / young people	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	4	0	3
Proposals will have a positive impact on - older people	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for - older people	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	0	1
Concern about the impact on transport options for older people (e.g. that the proposals will cause isolation)	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	2	6	1	2
Proposals will have a positive impact on – men / males	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for – men / males	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	0	1
Proposals will have a positive impact on – women / females	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for – women / females	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0

	Bus	Coach	Minibus	Leisure Vehicle	LGV	HGV	PHV	Hackney Carriage	Private car	Other vehicle	None
Proposals will have a positive impact on – disabled / vulnerable people/those with health issues	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	7	1	0
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for - disabled people	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	2	18	2	3
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for - those with health issues	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	4
Concern about the impact on transport options for disabled (e.g. that the proposals will cause isolation)	2	2	2	3	8	0	1	5	29	5	5
Concern that not all disabilities / health issues will be considered	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	10	1	2
Proposals will have a positive impact on – pregnancy / maternity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for – pregnancy / maternity	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proposals will have a positive impact on - certain ethnic / religious groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for - certain ethnic / religious groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	9	0	3
Concerns that funding / financial support will not be available / suitable to certain ethnic / religious groups	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	1	1
Proposals will have a positive impact on – poorest / lowest income households / people	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Proposals will have a negative impact on / should be more consideration for – poorest / lowest income households / people	1	0	2	14	28	0	6	7	98	6	20
Support age and gender	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	2
Support disability and pregnant	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	7	1	3
Support ethnicity and religion	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	1
Do not support age and gender	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
Do not support disability and pregnant	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Do not support ethnicity and religion	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	0	0
Other	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	13	2	3
<b>Base</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>280</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>51</b>

