

# Appendix 3: Recommendations in depth

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice under each recommendation. The following is a compilation of all the comments received.

The **overall ranking** of each recommendation is based upon a calculation of the level of support each recommendation received. If it received a 'strongly support' vote it received two points and a 'support' vote, one point. The **percentage support** figure was obtained by calculating the percentage of 'strongly support'/'support' votes of the total number of people who recorded a vote for that recommendation.

## Recommendation 1.

All public transport buses should be fully electric by 2025. Despite higher initial cost, running costs will be much lower so will pay for themselves over time.

**Overall Rank: 1st Rank within Theme: 1st**

**Percentage support: 97%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
26	7	1	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

### Strongly support

- Strongly agree. It is vital we end the use of petrol / diesel vehicles.
- Not only will electric buses help directly with air pollution, they are typically quieter, making them more pleasant to use, and better for residents living along bus routes.
- Absolutely agree.
- I love this. Ambitious but achievable target
- Absolutely necessary
- Great action that would improve air quality.
- High priority
- Definitely time for that, and cabs as well.
- Absolutely agree.
- This seems to be the way things are going anyway so no harm in putting a deadline in place that is challenging.
- Electric buses are cleaner, quieter and much more pleasant to travel on. Additional benefit of being more appealing to use, as well as less polluting.
- I wholeheartedly agree. Putting electric buses on Putney High Street and moving the polluting ones elsewhere in the bureau is not the answer.
- Electric car better than traditional car on air quality impact.
- Important and sounds feasible
- This is a no brainer. Hybrids are not good enough for heavy payloads.
- Electrifying public transport is the only way to meet our goal.

Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Seems aggressive and not completely in the control of Wandsworth I imagine.</li> <li>Recently implemented 'efficient petrol buses' could be moved to other boroughs. As Wandsworth Council has been identified as needing an action plan, it is perhaps justified to make this transition and work with a Council that has less efficient buses but no need for an Action Plan.</li> <li>This has proven to improve air quality on the High Street already, so it's a good one.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More pressing things to recommend, as this will happen anyways.</li> </ul>
Oppose
Strongly oppose

**Recommendation 2.**

**Incentivising behavior change**

To get people on board we need to show the tangible benefits of tackling air pollution e.g.

- a) It will make communities more hospitable for kids and families
- b) We can use the pandemic to show the reduction in conditions like asthma

Information on practical, tangible actions that people can do to reduce air pollution should also be shared.

**Overall Rank: 2nd Rank within Theme: 1st**

**Percentage support: 94%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
26	8	2	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I believe again that big businesses need to be a priority, as they are often the largest air polluters. E.g. Amazon, DHL, UPS, Uber etc. if these large companies can be incentivized to change, through grants, fines, and education, then it will be a great start to tackling the problem. E.g. grants for cargo bikes and electric delivery vehicles, fines for continued use of petrol/diesel delivery vehicles.</li> <li>Residents of Wandsworth must be made aware of how this issue affects them and their health.</li> <li>Think showing the benefits of change is a known way of improving.</li> <li>Definitely of all ages groups.</li> <li>Greatest barrier to change is people thinking that air pollution is a real issue and one that has a genuine impact on their lives and their health.</li> <li>A better informed and enabled Wandsworth resident is vital to reducing air pollution.</li> <li>Self-explanatory and sensible.</li> </ul>

- Enhance the knowledge to people.
- It is important to give the public good reasons to support the Council’s policies.
- This will allow people to understand the reasons behind any changes that may affect their lives greatly.
- Please write a sentence or two explaining your choice
- I would also add that we need to share the financial gain from reducing air pollution and having healthier people. I would also go as far to talk about all the negative impacts not just asthma. Through the awareness/education people should be made aware about wood burners and how detrimental they are to residents who have them.

Support

- This is quite loose at the moment as a recommendation.
- Would help with education on air quality etc.
- The data about side roads vs main roads should certainly be shared, I was unaware of it before joining the Assembly and I considered myself to be reasonably well informed about Air Pollution. Beware of over-using medical data – with the exception of asthma the risk data for other conditions is present though weak and can be refuted or minimised

Neither support nor oppose

Oppose

Strongly oppose

**Recommendation 3.****Better integration of services**

The aim should be to make less polluting travel options e.g. bus or cycling the quickest option by increasing safety, speed and connectivity rather than making other options slower.

There must be better collaboration and integration between the different organisations/institutions that provide services, to give better connections between different types of transport (e.g. tube and cycling links; bikes at stations) for ease of travel and safety

**Overall Rank: 3rd Rank within Theme: 2nd**

**Percentage support: 97%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
24	11	1	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

### Strongly support

- We are all multimodal travelers. Not just bus users or cyclists or drivers. We are Walk-Train-Walk or Drive-train-walk or Walk-Bus. etc. etc. and we do different things for different needs! Until the council starts asking and appreciating that we all travel using all modes, we won't build structures to allow that. We NEED more bike parking at train stations, we NEED park and ride options from further out of London, we need better bus routes, we need safe cycling infrastructure, we need clean walking routes away or set back from busy roads. We NEED accessible stations and public transport.
- Lack of connectivity and ease is a major barrier to more widespread use of public transport. Taking the bus or train should be easy and hassle-free
- Agree with making low carbon methods more appealing – would also include lower costs into this.
- I believe that improving public transport and access to bikes/ cycles lanes is the number 1 most important thing we can do.
- Definitely need some radical changes in regards to road layout /traffic issues.
- Travel options are not always joined up, and the location of bike hire stations can seem random, rather than strategically planned. Firmly agree that the solution is not to make car travel very onerous (and indeed more polluting) but to offer easy and viable alternatives.
- Agree.
- It should not take so long with so many changes to get across the borough, or across South London, or from central London. Buses should be more frequent and regular. The overground from Wandsworth town should be MORE regular and overnight. People use cars if there are no late-night trains. Propose Northern Line extension in Wandsworth town.
- This is smart policy that will help make a switch away from air polluting and climate endangering transport possible and desirable.
- Transportation affect air quality.
- This is a top priority for pollution on the streets.
- I agree because the safer and better improved the transport is the higher chance of Wandsworth citizens using them more than cars.
  
- I strongly agree. I think the fastest, most direct way to tackle air pollution and climate change is to decrease thre amount of private vehicles on the road. The only way to do that is to make other options more attractive/ more feasible.

Support

- I support this statement as a whole, but I believe it could be refined and more clear. It is too vague, and my concern is that it does not set any clear goals with associated dates. I am wary that “Better collaboration and integration” is not something that can be measured and is something that can be committed to without any real action.
- Agree with most if it but if as a consequence cars get slowed down I’m not against that. I agree deliberately slowing cars down alone doesn’t really make sense but perhaps the text should be clarified.
- Having quicker public transport options would increase the number of people choosing these alternative options.
- Good infrastructures are essential.
- More bike hangers at tube stations. Wandsworth may have little sway with tfl and so would need to lobby the Mayor’s office.
- Look at ways to improve options and have better connections – to a point – in a cost effective way.
- Bike libraries not necessary if we have santander coverage, although access to bike tools can be invaluable (consider the tool library that Earlsfield library offer – it could be marketed better). Also open up the ability for residents to collect broken bike’s and parts to make their own – like a salvage yard. Improves DIY skills.

Neither support nor oppose

- Although several modes of transport may be needed for a journey, this adds to the inconvenience. Focus should be on improving services individually except for when considering cycling. Safer storage for bicycles at Earlsfield station – without the need to worry about whether a users bicycle will be stolen or damaged if left unattended and locked up.

Oppose

Strongly oppose

**Recommendation 4.**

**Education** -Not enough people are aware of the scale of the problem in Wandsworth and that it affects everyone.

To remedy this:

- a) GPs should inform people, especially vulnerable people (like pregnant women) of the health risks of exposure to air pollution and areas to avoid
- b) Use existing media displays to educate, give air quality statistics and provide tangible action to tackle air pollution
- c) Have Air Quality Champions (local residents) and guest speakers like local campaign groups and specialists informing secondary schools, faith communities and workplaces
- d) Campaigns on social media (using multiple platforms to reach different sections of the community)
- e) Having more signage on the roads about air quality e.g. reduce speed limits ' x mph because of air quality'

**Overall Rank: 4th Rank within Theme: 2nd**

**Percentage support: 94%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
20	14	1	1	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

#### Strongly support

- I think it's important to quantify the problem. The current metrics are a bit abstract and not helped by the WHO level being so much harsher than the UK level. How do we communicate what this means.
- Love the idea of displays. Education is A LOT harder than just implementing policy though.
- Media displays in public places (e.g bus stops) are already used to disseminate information to the public, this is clear avenue for expansion.
- N/A - just really like this.
- Easy and important to implement.
- Information campaign on Air Quality and Climate Change in Wandsworth desperately needed.
- Information is key and increasing awareness is fundamental for people to act.
- I strongly believe that educating residents should be a high priority.
- GP's should surely discuss better health and better lifestyle choices. ("Lifestyle over medication" – this ethos improves health, reduces NHS cost, NHS resources and drives forward borough targets of resident health and reduced pollution. Making use of existing media i.e. digital billboards is a good use of resources.
- Definitely as much as possible.
- Greatest barrier to change is people thinking that air pollution is a real issue and one that has a genuine impact on their lives and their health. But this can only work in tandem with real and tangible action that all residents need to take, otherwise it will be an empty campaign.
- Where Wandsworth leads, hopefully other boroughs will follow.
- Making people aware that there is a problem is the first step to winning public support to address it. Without education, measures to improve air will face backlash and fail.
- Increase knowledge to people.
- Yes, it is necessary to raise public awareness of the problem if people are to accept the solutions.

- Spreading the word on air pollution and it's affects happening in Wandsworth itself will scare people into a better change.
- I think the premise to any drastic action should be wide range of education & awareness so that the public understand why these new measures are being taken. As a mother I would want my GP to tell me the moment I get pregnant about the dangers of poor quality air but as a human I would want my GP to also warn me about the impacts of poor air quality on my body. Doctors are trusted and they can be a great way of spreading awareness. People have less trust in social media as it's a platform for debate and distrust. Schools, GP clinics, real-time monitors are better.

Support

- I believe this is true - I always believed I was quite well informed on air pollution until the citizens assembly, where I am sure I won't be alone in saying I was shocked by some of the facts presented to us.

Neither support nor oppose

- The devil is in the detail here. Most people cannot get an appointment with the GP for several weeks and when they do so probably want to discuss the presenting condition rather than something else. I am not sure what an Air Quality Champion would achieve outside highly polluted area. Reducing speed limits WORSENS air pollution because the ICE is less efficient at say 20mph than at 30mph. The primary reason for speed reduction is to avoid fatal accidents particularly to children, nearly all of whom survive if hit at 20mph but not at 30mph

Oppose

-

Strongly oppose

-

**Recommendation 5.**

**We need a public transport system that is attractive for people to use**

This should be done through:

- a) Improved and revised bus routes with new routes, express routes, plans for 'dead zone' areas (that have few or unconnected services), more frequent services and where appropriate buses that stop more or less on certain routes.
- b) Addressing the fact that some people feel uncomfortable on public transport because it can be dirty (no bins) and loud
- c) Ensuring all stations are step free (lifts/ramps etc) by 2028

**Overall Rank: 5th Rank within Theme: 3rd**

**Percentage support: 94%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
24	10	2	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

**Strongly support**

- I agree with this as I believe the average every day person needs to be convinced to use public transport - if more people could use them as opposed to driving a car on their commute it would make a huge difference to air pollution.
- No one with a disability should have to revise their route because someone is prioritising profit over human beings. Make all stations accessible ASAP.
- Dead zone areas are a big problem due to residents being forced to use their cars. Improving bus connections would greatly benefit not just users of public transport, but drivers too (fewer cars on the road)
- I believe that improving public transport and access to bikes/ cycles lanes is the number 1 most important thing we can do.
- Those are key actions that need to be taken in place. All very valuable.
- Agree with a and c. B is a minor inconvenience at best as on the whole it is okay. – Focus on convenience over luxury.
- Agree.
- Better inner borough transport.  
Better and more frequent trains on Southwestern train service and the buses from central London. More public transport options will prevent people from using Ubers. The more regular and reliable services, more people will use it. The overground from Wandsworth town should be MORE regular and overnight. People use cars if there are no late-night trains. Propose Northern Line extension in Wandsworth town. Free transport for Wandsworth citizens
- Encourage people using public transportation.
- All good, but include the public transport items from 1 to avoid duplication. Perhaps public transport should be in a different section to private transport by foot, bike, car etc.
- Setting the target and including everyone is a very key factor as it makes public transport more appealing and so more people will use.
- As long as there is no waste; and public transport is not empty – because it's a waste public funds.
- I whole-heartedly agree with this especially with points:  
B — Public transport needs to be cleaner, less stuffy (so you don't feel like a stranger is coughing right in your face.)



C — Yes all stations across the UK should be easily accessible to everyone with a buggy/wheelchair, walking cane, heavy suitcase, etc.
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• For years some parts of the borough have had no or little public transport options. So this would be a great idea. Even with step free there are regular issues with lifts / escalators not working and when you do need them you are then subjected to abuse for using them</li> <li>• Generally agree but don't think I know enough to define what the most important actions are.</li> <li>• I think there should be a priority in those areas but I think they're better options for people that can regardless of public transport. Not all people can use them though so public transport expansion is still important where routes are non-viable.</li> <li>• Agree with the new bus routes, the other two are good and important but less to me personally.</li> <li>• Not sure about the wording of clause b. There are many reasons some are uncomfortable about using public transport, more than the lack of bins.</li> <li>• Strongly agree with (a); I'm not sure bins on buses are a priority but rather public education about not littering in public spaces generally; I support (c) but am aware the financial implications/practicalities of it may be daunting</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already Wandsworth is brilliantly connected.</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-

<b>Recommendation 6.</b>				
<b>Data collection</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) The council needs in to invest in at least 100 real time air quality monitors which measure NO2 and PM2.5 (enough monitors to provide data so all residents can accurately plan their routes based on levels of air quality about them)</li> <li>b) More accurate data is needed to help assess how effective air quality measures/actions are.</li> <li>c) Collect traffic data and display to positively reinforce actions eg. number of cars today/number of cars last week</li> <li>d) Explore complexity around accuracy of data in terms of daily average vs annual average.</li> <li>e) Consider displaying data in comparison to UK average &amp; WHO guidelines</li> <li>f) Council to share progress quarterly.</li> </ul>				
<b>Overall Rank: =6th Rank within Theme: 3rd</b>				
<b>Percentage support: 94%</b>				
Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
18	11	5	1	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

### Strongly support

- Strongly agree with this. The data collection is fundamental to understand our environment and air pollution, and also act as shock value when these statistics are displayed to the public. This data can be tied in with advertising to raise awareness too, as well as tracking how air pollution measures either improve or conversely do not make a lot of difference to the air quality.
- The council sharing progress on a quarterly basis is something that a lot of us believe is one of the most important recommendations of all. Without this, we will be in the dark on what is being implemented and how it is being tracked.
- More data is essential to identify hot spots, monitor improvements and guide people on how to lower their exposure.
- I'm not sure of the importance of traffic data as that's visible to people already, air quality is much harder to see
- Hierarchy of Controls. Not sure the above measures follow this hierarchy. Ban Cars, segregated safe infrastructure, slow down vehicles, make vehicles smaller. Absolutely extend Santander/docked bikes. All stations should have them.
  
- I agree with collecting more data, displaying it as a comparison (maybe in live time?) etc but unsure that spending money on more monitors is needed. Would split this response between support and neither support or oppose.
- Measurable and achievable.
- Factual accurate data must be shared. Data should also be provided absolute and relative (e.g. over time, vs WHO guidelines, vs other Boroughs or London overall, etc.)
- Hard evidence is needed to show what is going on with pollution.
- To be able to say 'One monitor per half a mile' for instance, this would give locality to the data that ensures buy in from all residents and commuters. It's important to couple the air quality data with familiar data so that residents can see the correlation between their choices and the quality of air. Without the 'familiar data', the numbers are much less tangible and understandable. Real time air quality displays in public places should show the current levels versus WHO guideline AND UK guideline. There were concerns raised by Dr Jo Barnes from UWE (her discussions were collaborative, insightful and by all accounts very helpful) that showing real time versus annual averages from WHO and UK would be misleading – my argument would be that the intended outcome of this is to give a directionally accurate view and so the focus should be on giving the reader a reality check rather than a perfect comparison and that's a caveat that can be shared if you were to feel it's needed in the small print. I think it will be the best driver for positive change than if you decided to proceed without this reporting.
- Definitely to be able to learn.
- The impact of any actions taken by the council and individuals will not be understood unless there is appropriate monitoring and benchmarking.
- Actions from data.
- Yes, Council policies need to be evidence based.
- Having access to this data will benefit all the council and the community in believing and seeing the need for change desperately.
- I would say monitors are very useful in places such as nurseries/schools/ public spaces where a lot of pedestrians are out and about.

### Support

- Do we need more? We know there is a problem already. Maybe more sites to collect concurrently and display their results in situ.
- We must act as role models to other boroughs, who are also failing their residents in their attempts to track air pollution.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will enable everyone to really know what is happening and make changes and choices accordingly.</li> <li>• These are really sensible suggestions.</li> <li>• More air quality monitors would be extremely useful enabling a better picture to be built up but this obviously needs to be balanced against cost.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need to display, it's an additional cost.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose

### Recommendation 7.

#### Improved cycling infrastructure

Infrastructure should be improved by:

- segregating cycle lanes, food pathways & vehicles
- every junction in Wandsworth where cyclists wait to have cycle boxes
- accelerate cycle hanger installations - all apartment buildings to have one. Change request policy to proactive installation
- All streets with parking spaces to have at least one designated bike parking to include push bikes/e bikes/e scooters

**Overall Rank: =6th Rank within Theme: 1st**

**Percentage support: 89%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
14	14	8	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly agree, as I believe this will increase cyclist safety and overall awareness.</li> <li>• Clarify every junction where cyclists are "required" to wait. Not just based on some judgment of whether cyclists typically wait there or not. The point of this is that at some junctions cyclists are on a segregated cycleway already. Also that there should be a cycle lane to get to the box.</li> <li>• This will make cycling significantly more attractive and convenient for many.</li> <li>• I think Wandsworth should lead by example and become London's friendliest cycling borough.</li> <li>• Yes riders are not safe for other users of the roads.</li> <li>• Particularly supportive of cycle hanger installation - currently living in a small block of flats with 4 bikes in the entrance hall, and at least 1 being kept in a bedroom.</li> <li>• Encourage cycling with better infrastructure.</li> <li>• All good, but bike hangers should be installed in proportion to the number of dwellings, not the length of the street.</li> <li>• I agree because providing space will help motivate people into using bikes.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I would cycle but it doesn't feel safe and I'm not even sure as there is no designated cycling lane but just sort of a painted lane on the tar. It doesn't stop cars coming close to me and intimidating me with their large vehicles.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A, it seems like a good idea. I actually don't</li> <li>All good actions – cycling in London is definitely something not promoted by the council/city.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I don't understand i) what is a food pathway? ii) many of them already do and cyclists tend to cross early whenever they can so don't use them iii) seems fine iv) agree for pedal cycles but not for e-vehicles. I therefore both support and oppose so give a null answer</li> </ul>
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Segregating cycle lanes, like the way the redesign has been done for Tooting is not beneficial for cyclists or cars. Giving up a car parking space on the street is not going to help. it needs to be an encouragement to not drive your car.</li> </ul>

### Recommendation 8.

#### Improve safety for cyclists & pedestrians by

- offering bikeability training to residents starting with primary age
- co-producing regulations with residents which can be incentivised and enforced
- enforce regulations around electric bikes
- develop regulation for e-scooters
- v) No overtaking road markings in dangerous areas

**Overall Rank: =8th Rank within Theme: 2nd**

**Percentage support: 92%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
21	12	3	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This makes sense, as many people do not cycle around London, particularly in central areas, due to safety concerns.</li> <li>Agree with this. Perhaps start with improving safety for cyclists and pedestrians being a primary goal. With the points being possible ideas for how to do this.</li> <li>Hierarchy of Controls. Not sure the above measures follow this hierarchy. Ban Cars, Segregated safe infrastructure, slow down vehicles, make vehicles smaller.</li> <li>Many people are scared to cycle because of inexperience, or the car-centric rules on the road.</li> <li>Lead by example with e-scooter regulations. I hope this will not discourage the use of e-scooter and bike rentals but rather make these safer for everyone.</li> <li>Strongly support but this point 2. seems a "weak" duplication of point 4. Below</li> <li>Common sense.</li> <li>Yes as bicycle riders are a massive issue lately, and also they should be taxed as well.</li> </ul>

- Cycling in London, especially for kids will only ever be SAFE, when proper cycle lanes are built and dangerous drivers dealt with properly.
- It's a smart idea to ensure the shops in a neighbourhood are ones residents actually need; we should not have a half dozen real estate agents/betting shops/fast-food shops and no banks/groceries/etc in a neighbourhood, so licensing could help with this. Public consultation to determine what are key needed local businesses (things people now have to drive elsewhere for) is key.
- Encourage cycling with safety considerations.
- Excellent idea, and should be extended to other large flat-roof buildings, such as supermarkets.
- Education and enforcement of traffic codes and regulations should be applied to bikes as well as e-bikes/scooters.
- Providing safer routes would help people in taking bikes or walking more.
- More needs to be done to enforce road rules and pedestrian/cyclist safety.

Support

- This would mean more people are comfortable to bike to areas within the borough if more training to be a better bike user is taught there may be fewer issues. Also educating people on e-scooter and how to ride them responsibly.
- Cycling in London can be scary so people must feel confident to do so.
- e-scooters should keep to the road in all circumstances.
- Think this needs to be a co-design between cyclists and car users, in order to have a system that works well for both.
- Agree that active travel has to have an equal spot at the table - but that it also must be matched with an understanding of the needs of those who have no option other than cars.
- See previous response re e-bike/scooter regulations.
- All these are positive with the exception of ii) which sounds like LTNs by the back door iii) and iv) require national not local action.

Neither support nor oppose

- Unsure how effective this would be.
- Feels relatively safe already

Oppose

Strongly oppose

Strongly oppose

Strongly oppose

**Recommendation 9.**

**Bike storage** - Businesses should provide off street and secure bike storage for employees or offer them space in a bike hanger to encourage employees to use bikes at night/long shift.

**Overall Rank: =8th Rank within Theme: 1st**

**Percentage support: 89%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
22	10	4	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think this is a good recommendation as it incentivises employees not to drive to work.</li> <li>• The more support for cycling as a form of transport the better.</li> <li>• Doesn't have to be off street, why not on street instead of a car parking space? Secure is key here.</li> <li>• Lack of safe storage is a massive reason preventing wide-scale adoption of existing cycle-to-work schemes.</li> <li>• I feel this will encourage people to cycle.</li> <li>• No car use and health habit promotion. Can be combined with bike to work scheme.</li> <li>• Definitely more storage for bikes, too many trouble with removing the rentals and too much money spent by council trying to tackle pavement bike pollution.</li> <li>• Absolutely essential if people are to feel empowered to choose different forms of transport.</li> <li>• This shouldn't just be for nights/long shifts. This should apply 24/7. If employers offer secure bike storage facilities at their workplaces, then more people will be encouraged to commute to work on bikes instead of cars or busses.</li> <li>• Not sure if the night/long shifts qualifier is needed.</li> <li>• Encouragement on more cycle usage.</li> <li>• It might be better to include this point with the one on residential bike storage.</li> <li>• This would allow for encouragement for cycling and help lower emissions.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A. Good idea but again unsure if it would be the most impactful way to reduce air quality vs other methods mentioned.</li> <li>• Lack of secure storage a key limiting factor in cycling.</li> <li>• This may be challenging for individual small businesses; it may need to be a provision provided in blocks or groupings of businesses.</li> <li>• This is a good idea but space needs to be a consideration; there needs to be a lower cut off in terms of site area and employee numbers.</li> <li>• I myself don't cycle, I use public transport/walk. However I can definitely appreciate that cycling is a great alternative. We should make it as easy as possible to be a cyclist.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not all business will have the space etc.</li> <li>• Not always safe for residents to cycle late at night. Better bus and transport routes should be prioritized over this.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Why only to encourage employees to use for night/long shifts. Why not during the day shifts as well?</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-

**Recommendation 10.**

**Data usage and sharing**

Data collected by the Council needs to be accessible and usable, so people can see it and understand it and its relevance to health and climate.

- a) Use live displays from Breath London Nodes (or other brands which monitor in the same way) to display real time air quality at bus stops/billboards - use existing info sharing infrastructure
- b) Compulsory air quality signage outside schools; recommended air quality signage outside tube stations, markets, high streets
- c) Have focus groups to understand how to make signage which resonates with residents so they can interpret and use data

**Overall Rank: =10th Rank within Theme: 4th**

**Percentage support: 94%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
20	14	1	1	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think scare tactics can go a long way and do help, but it really comes down to enforcement. If people see that the air quality really is bad, they will likely still drive to work the next day if that is their only means of doing so. Fines for driving in these highly polluted areas would be more of a deterrent in my opinion.</li> <li>Yes. SHOW the problem so that people can't avoid it or dig their heads in the sand.</li> <li>People in our community deserve to know what they're breathing in</li> <li>Follows on from my last comment – nothing further</li> <li>No need to reinvent the wheel, just stick live display monitors in critical points showing NOx/etc. inhaled versus WHO guidelines (and "if you want to find out more, please go to..." whatever page on the Council's website).</li> <li>Focus groups could be substituted with PR specialists in other fields.</li> <li>This will enable everyone to really know what is happening and make changes and choices accordingly.</li> <li>Data information for action and monitoring.</li> <li>This is OK, depending on how expensive and practicable it is.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing the people of the community access to the information they will most likely believe air pollution is happening around them and will initiate a change in them.</li> <li>• Signage should be simple and easily understood by everyone. I would only display the WHO guidelines.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think communicating this number in a quantifiable way is difficult. Numbers don't mean much, what is high/medium/low. Is it in relation to local norms (even if that is always above WHO) in which case it may give a false sense of everything being ok. Or in relation to WHO, or UK numbers etc. etc.</li> <li>• Yes although remembering of the safety issues that might arise from publication.</li> <li>• Communicating the scale of the issue is really important - but need to be careful not to target in such a way that it disincentivizes people from walking/taking public transport, if it is perceived that being outside (including outside a vehicle) is dangerous.</li> <li>• I totally agree that making data collected by the council accessible and useable is key (including online, not just on signs) and that signage is key, though there is a risk of people paying less attention to it over time. A traffic light signal system for air quality – green, amber, red, purple – could be more useful than precise numbers in some settings.</li> <li>• This has been covered elsewhere. Apart from schools it would be useful in highly polluted areas such as Putney High St/East Hill</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
-
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would rather invest money elsewhere</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
-



**Recommendation 11.****Maintain and improve green areas**

Wandsworth Council to maintain and improve green areas:

- a) Include the community in setting up and keeping it. Use neighbourhood gardening groups to help keep the cost down.
- b) have plants that are easy to care for
- c) set up automatic watering systems if the local community can't support with watering
- d) iv) connect green areas with safe cycling and walking routes

**Overall Rank: =10th Rank within Theme: 1st**

**Percentage support: 89%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
21	11	4	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

#### Strongly support

- Especially point 4. Why are so many of our parks/commons not connected via safe cycling infrastructure or why is cycling banned in many parks?
- Improving community space is very important.
- Would encourage more people to take care of surroundings.
- Excellent idea.
- More citizen green groups.
- Green areas improving air quality.
- I agree because while creating new ones is amazing but maintaining the original ones would benefit better.
- I would also add to plant plants that don't need too much maintenance and that are drought resistant, winter-hardy. I also strongly support walking paths and cycling paths through green spaces. The parks we currently have aren't very green they are more like football fields with little tree cover, no foliage and barely any life except for the cute dogs.

#### Support

- This is a great idea, but for years the council have ignored a redevelopment of green spaces, to make them more usable. Take Tooting Common, there is a disused pond where people sit to take drugs.
- This is beneficial to resident's health, as well as their emotional wellbeing.
- It would be cheeky to ask the community to take on gardening responsibility for free. Consider community service for offenders. Youth clubs etc. Place a ban on artificial grass. Can enforce this for front gardens. Have trust that it's not being laid in back gardens.
- Wandsworth is already blessed with large green spaces. The commons should be linked with a 'green route' similar to Lewisham doses with Crystal Palace, Sydenham Woods, Dulwich Park etc.
- I strongly agree with (iv) above; in (ii) I would argue to have plants not just that are easy to care for but that maximize carbon storage; we should be planting tree species that are as large as possible in spaces big enough to accommodate them rather than adding mainly smaller ornamental species.
- Green is good if it promotes health, is practical, safe and not misused.

Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green spaces are nice but not sure how they relate to the goals outlined with regards air quality.</li> <li>It is an ok idea to improve the space in which we live.</li> <li>I don't think suggestion iii) works, and feels like it is likely to waste water, or be more labour and carbon intensive than the scheme itself. Plants that do well in drier conditions would be more sensible.</li> <li>Wandsworth do a fairly good job of maintaining my local green area, Wandsworth Common. I do not know of any Council shortcomings with respect to other green areas so cannot comment further.</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-

### Recommendation 12.

#### Turn large paved areas into green spaces

We want a greener borough. Wandsworth Council should turn large public paved areas into green spaces with trees and large plants. Clear accessible routes should be created through the spaces. Include the community and neighbourhood gardening groups in creating and maintaining them.

**Overall Rank: =10th Rank within Theme: 2nd**

**Percentage support: 86%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
22	9	5	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I agree with this, as this not only supports the lessening of air pollution but also supports physical exercise, sport, and improves mental health.</li> <li>Similarly to a couple of the other recommendations, I think this is a great idea and would provide a wide range of benefits over and about improved AQ. This should be part of an improvement program, maybe even over and above this assembly.</li> <li>Definitely need more greenery for wildlife especially.</li> <li>Excellent idea.</li> <li>Definitely needed as there are a lot of grey areas in Wandsworth.</li> <li>More trees with improving air quality.</li> <li>Important to encourage local participation, to save Council money and give people a stake in maintaining the space and guarding against vandalism. But see below.</li> <li>This won't do much directly to impact air pollution but there should definitely be more green spaces to beautify the borough. It's great for mental health and makes walking around the borough much more enjoyable. When greening also consider blue spaces like ponds, foliage, teeming with life. Make the green space something that people don't walk through but they can stop and watch the ducks.</li> </ul>

Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is beneficial to resident’s health, as well as their emotional wellbeing</li> <li>• Agreed. However, considering the ‘air trapping’ effect that plants can have based on their location, the green space plan should be well developed.</li> <li>• Ensuring the maintenance of these areas is key. Involving residents tends to only work if there is already motivated resident group.</li> <li>• Great idea - Please give an example of a large public paved area and I’ll know what this means.</li> <li>• I agree as it would not only make Wandsworth look prettier but safer for pedestrians and cyclists and help lower emissions.</li> <li>• There are too many buildings coming up – perhaps that should be also addressed.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Green spaces they have aren’t enough so this would be nice but the council don’t maintain the green areas and a lot of them are difficult to get out or badly lit meaning people don’t like using them when it gets darker.</li> <li>• Green spaces are nice but not sure how they relate to the goals outlined with regards air quality.</li> <li>• Paved is usually v helpful for providing a flat surface for accessible and active transport. But where possible, good design principles and building beautiful and engaging spaces should be done. This would include plants etc.</li> <li>• Not sure how viable it is in London due to the battle for space of any kind.</li> <li>• I do not think this will drastically improve air quality - but it will make the borough a more pleasant area to move around on foot.</li> <li>• I want a greener borough but am having difficulty imaging what “large public paved areas” we are talking about here without examples.</li> </ul>
Oppose
Strongly oppose
-

**Recommendation 13.**

**Making school air quality information available**

Air quality information from areas around schools should be made available to parents/carers on publicly available websites e.g. on the schools’ websites and on notice boards outside schools

**Overall Rank: =13th Rank within Theme: 1st**

**Percentage support: 94%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
18	16	2	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to ‘write a sentence or two explaining your choice’. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I believe this will help parents/teachers understand how bad the pollution levels are, and band together to lobby for change. Providing this information to them is better than concealing it.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relies on that data being captured but yes parents need to know for long term decisioning making and create pressure for change. The live numbers being displayed are less useful I think.</li> <li>• Parents should be able to include air pollution as a factor when deciding on what school their child should attend, and how they should travel there.</li> <li>• This may depend on the capability of the school website designers so the council should have responsibility for sharing the information on their website i.e. postcode lookup or school search gives the closest air monitor readings.</li> <li>• YES !! MOST DEFINITELY YES!!</li> <li>• Data for monitoring and actions.</li> <li>• Yes, other cities have them.</li> <li>• When selecting schools it's important not only it be based on the education and behaviour but the health standard and air pollution levels.</li> <li>• Yes. Please include nurseries on this informational website.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be made available but not displayed all the time. People can therefore ask if they wish.</li> <li>• Would help with keeping air pollution on everyone's agenda.</li> <li>• Might help although might arise problems which schools got enough already.</li> <li>• Access to data should cause people to think about their actions, especially idling. Risk that too much information leads to more car use, rather than less.</li> <li>• People do need to know the extent of the problem in these areas.</li> <li>• This is a good idea.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
-
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-

### Recommendation 14

#### New homes

The Council should only approve planning permission for new developments which:

- Are near public transport or have provision for new public transport links and other active transport provision.
- Are compliant with the highest possible standards for energy efficiency (including home heating) and air quality.
- The construction process itself is compliant with the highest available standard for air quality.
- The council should be resourced to ensure compliance with all of the above.

**Overall Rank: =13th Rank within Theme: 1st**

**Percentage support: 92%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
21	12	1	2	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support

- I agree with this, but I think the “highest possible standard” needs to be refined so as to give a clear regulation for what can and can’t be built.
- YES. Limit the amount of profit that can be made for creating new housing and make them build up to the standards that their CEO would live in. Force developers to have skin in the game and create liveable, efficient housing.
- The necessity of energy-efficient housing will grow exponentially in the future, so starting now will be most cost effective.
- This would also encourage the use of public transport and active modes of transport.
- Definitely must be implemented.
- Doesn’t make any sense to build new inefficient homes, or ones that will make people reliant on cars. The construction process must also be applied to any extensions/works on existing properties, as well as to new builds.
- YES, AGREE! Compulsory Heat Pumps in ALL new developments. New Gas Boiler installations should NOT be allowed.
- New homes permitted should have insulation, heating and hot water systems that will not need retrofitting for climate change or air pollution measures in the coming 20 years.
- Make it as legal requirement.
- Yes, and this accords with the Council’s climate change agenda.
- This is vague and will obviously need cutting into shape but at least has the merit of being a matter over which the council already has considerable powers.
- I strongly support this. New builds should not have to be retrofitted later on.

Support

- Another one where I think it’s a good idea, but would need to be part of a wider council/government incentive scheme I think.
- In general, there will of course be housing targets to consider but here are some notes (a for a, b for b etc.)
  - a) This is flawed as you will hinder housing developments if the councils have their shortcomings on infrastructure targets.
  - b) It is much more efficient to do it this way than to retrofit – agree completely on this.
  - c) Wandsworth isn’t a hugely industry-heavy borough, so where construction and industry do operate, Wandsworth should ensure the highest possible standards to shine as a beacon for the work they are doing across the borough
- Agreed, but this should be incentivised heavily so that this doesn’t worsen the housing crisis
- This must also apply to ‘affordable housing’ and not be a barrier to building more affordable housing
- I agree as it would be fair and provide for a positive future for everyone.

Neither support nor oppose

- I am not sure how measure a) can be feasible, but I agree on b) and c). These could have a big impact on pollution connected with poor insulation etc.
- Good long-term idea.

Oppose

-

Strongly oppose

-

**Recommendation 15****Enforcing the banning of idling**

The banning of idling outside schools should be enforced by inspectors in school areas who can give fines. Parents/carers should be notified of this through:

- a) Emails and discussions with school staff
- b) Notices on school gates
- c) Information given by lollipop people

Schools must take responsibility for sharing information about this enforcement

**Overall Rank: =13th Rank within Theme: 2nd**

**Percentage support: 89%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
21	11	3	1	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

### Strongly support

- Strongly agree with this. I believe once people are fined, they will start to learn quickly not to idle anymore.
- GIVE TRAFFIC WARDENS THE ABILITY TO FINE FOR IDLING.
- Parents should be aware of the effect their actions can have on their kids.
- A win-win.
- This is an additional way to increase awareness.
- ABSOLUTELY YES!!
- Law enforcement.
- Yes, simple to implement, at least by adding public notices around schools.
- As previously stated there needs to be a heavy campaign, both in the mass media and locally as per H & F before any efforts at enforcement.
- This will ensure with certainty that everyone has the best way of going to and from school without damaging the air further.
- Idling outside nurseries too please. I have already asked my nursery if they can put a sign up. They said they won't want idling but didn't seem bothered enough to put up a sign.

### Support

- Probably a small effect but part of a wider package ok.
- Common sense.
- Will be difficult to enforce by fines and may give parents a free conscience to 'pay their way through climate change' (see Freakonomics as an example where fees are prescribed for late collection of children from school). However, peer pressure and clear notices will drive the change the most. The only guarantee against idling would be cordoning off the school road in the morning/afternoon.
- I think schools are the easiest place for idling restrictions to be enforced.
- Unsure if the schools should be responsible for enforcement. Should it be traffic wardens instead?
- Consider also having children holding signs as a volunteer activity at drop off and pickup asking drivers not to idle.

Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Might work.</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-

### Recommendation 16

#### Improve access to bikes & equipment:

- a) bike libraries
- b) employer cycle schemes
- c) access to hi vis/helmets etc
- d) increase coverage of Santander bikes to cover the whole borough.
- e) incentivise appropriate use of e bikes via rental scheme to encourage better personal use until regulation and therefore enforcement catches up e.g. black box monitoring linked to account - rewards for good use/money off for using bays/money off for safety content/traffic school completion

**Overall Rank: =13th Rank within Theme: 3rd**

**Percentage support: 89%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
20	12	4	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Big fan of points 1 and 4 especially.</li> <li>• I think all of these points are great - anything to encourage the use of bikes over cars.</li> <li>• Not sure iii is as important as making the routes safer in the first place.</li> <li>• This is beneficial to the health of residents, as well as for drivers, who will find fewer cars on the road</li> <li>• I love this. Ambitious but achievable target.</li> <li>• Especially like the idea of help to buy bike safety equipment as this is often neglected as an obstacle to cycling.</li> <li>• Good ideas – but in (iv) we need more than Santander bikes; Lime/HumanForest/etc.</li> <li>• Encourage cycling with appropriate policy.</li> <li>• Some of this duplicates e-bike regulation etc in 2. Maybe 2 and 3 should distinguish between promotion of bike/ebike use and traffic regulations.</li> <li>• By helping people get equipment for bikes more people will use them as they can access anything they may need to replace.</li> <li>• I support this especially the employer cycle schemes and making bicycling more accessible.</li> </ul>

Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/A, sounds good.</li> <li>• There's already plenty of schemes to do so.</li> <li>• Agree that cycling needs to be safer, more accessible, and better regulated. Regulation means holding cyclists to account, as well as other road users.</li> <li>• Especially agree with iv) increase coverage of santander bikes to cover the whole borough</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without improving the safety and the roads this will not work.</li> <li>• i) ?? ii) would be worth checking with large employers such as St George's but they probably have one iii) why shouldn't they pay like everyone else iv) don't they already cover the whole borough? v) we need national guidance on e-bike rules before any such action</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-



**Recommendation 17****Existing homes**

Domestic properties should be helped to be more energy efficient. This should be by raising awareness & providing reliable advice on what can be done in the home e.g. insulation, heat pumps etc  
Means tested grants should be made available to support this with funding from local and national sources including energy companies.

**Overall Rank: =17th Rank within Theme: 2nd  
Percentage support: 92%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
19	13	3	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

### Strongly support

- Considering how expensive would be to make a house insulated, grants are crucial to let people take the action.
- Definitely must be implemented.
- This should NOT be means tested. It should be made available to ALL Wandsworth residents, as heat pumps are too expensive for most Wandsworth residents, and not just for those on benefits. ALL Wandsworth residents should be incentivized to switch to heat pumps, to reduce air pollution.
- Schemes must learn from the mistakes of previous ones.
- We should also ask the council with energy company help to create models retrofitted homes in Wandsworth that those considering work on their own home can visit to see the range of options/changes possible.
- Continuous improvement policy.
- I think this would greatly help people are who struggling and want to become more energy efficient but aren't entirely sure how or what would be the most logical/effective changes. Perhaps allow interest free loans as well as grants? If a grant is provided for 50% cost some people are still not willing to make the changes.

### Support

- Grants should not be means tested but available to everyone who desires to make their home more energy efficient.
- I assume these initiatives already exist so are we just agreeing with them or suggesting more on top?
- First part of this I believe is too watered down and not strong enough. Educating people on insulation will likely be insulting to people, as the vast majority of people already know that better insulation in their homes will reduce their heating costs and improve energy efficiency - they simply cannot afford it. I do however agree that reliable advice should be provided to people.
- I strongly agree that means tested grants should be provided for home energy improvements. My only concern is that if energy companies are to fund these grants, they will simply pass on the bill to the customer by raising overall prices. It would be good to investigate how these companies can be prevented from doing this, or even better, for the government to set up a national energy company to rival the private suppliers. (I understand this would be out of the council's remit, but in an ideal scenario!) potential lobbying national government to do this?

- Why means test? We'd waste more money on testing if people are eligible than just giving it to everyone! Also, those with more money still need to have efficient housing otherwise we have the same problem.
- People are lacking both understanding of what they can do, and opportunity to do it. HOWEVER, the grants should not be means tested, otherwise there will be many residents who do not qualify for grants, but who nevertheless cannot easily afford the improvements themselves.
- Feel like I can't add a lot of comment to this at the moment as I worry about feasibility/would need to be a wider council/gov thing?
- This already exists on the continent, e.g. in France house/flats below a certain rating can simply not be rented (with plenty of measures to help to insulate/etc.)
- Would help people with low incomes.
- I believe that there is a lot of advice out there – perhaps it needs to be better curated. Means tested grants are appropriate in this case due to the juxtaposition of incoming money to the borough versus 'old money' (meaning homeowners who have owned a house in the borough for many years, when the cost of owning was much cheaper)
- Strongly agree with need for subsidies - challenging in London, especially where house prices may have increased significantly over time, and so this needs to be considered sensitively.
- My support for this is weak as we have been round this circle before and grants weren't taken up. All developments of existing homes should be scrutinized for their impact on air pollution and heating/insulation – again this is a matter in which the council already has a degree of oversight.
- I agree because this will help the future of Wandsworth.

Neither support nor oppose

- Council should work with suppliers who can subsidise or offer financial incentives / not charge ridiculous prices for more energy efficient insulation, heat pumps, etc. Not sure the means tested grant route is going to do much.

Oppose

-

Strongly oppose

-

**Recommendation 18**

**Protect what is there:** Wandsworth Council must protect what is already there i.e. large established trees and green spaces

**Overall Rank: =17th Rank within Theme: 3rd**

**Percentage support: 89%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
20	12	3	1	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

### Strongly support

- I believe this is vital. If we do not protect what we already have, it starts a dangerous precedent for more green areas and trees being demolished.
- Needed for both AQ and carbon emission absorption, we shouldn't be cutting down old trees and replacing with new ones (new trees don't absorb carbon until they are 5 years old, many trees in local areas don't make it there)
- Covenants to be put in place and businesses should realise their responsibility around greenery.
- If trees \*need\* to be cut down, policy should be to replace threefold elsewhere.
- Agreed
- Unnecessary losses of mature, established trees – such as the felling of Chestnut Avenue on Tooting Common – are a massive loss for carbon storage, biodiversity, shade, air-pollution blocking and other key services. We should not look first to removing or doing major crown reductions on large, established and historic trees but instead look at innovative ways to protect them. We should have an annual assessment not of how many trees have been planted in Wandsworth, as we have now, but an assessment of how the tree biomass of the borough has changed in the last year; planting a few saplings does not compensate for the loss of large, established trees. We need to establish more tree protection orders on large trees that provide a range of valuable services.
- Trees improve air quality.
- Motherhood and apple pie. I think it does a fairly good job on the large green spaces.
- By not cutting down large old trees Wandsworth can save more by protecting than destroying.
- Mature trees should NOT be cut down. Young treeplings do not actually absorb a lot of CO2. I support this but I say it is also not enough to protect what currently exists. There must be more green/blue spaces.

### Support

- These are some of the primary drivers which encourage residents to go outside and enjoy being active. The health benefits are both physical and mental
- Agree. However, I am not sure what are the reasons why the council would remove established.
- We should not be creating large developments at the expense of green space.
- This should go without saying.

### Neither support nor oppose

- Green spaces are nice but not sure how they relate to the goals outlined with regards air quality.
- Wandsworth is already doing it

Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Old large trees are not necessarily the way to go. New greenery may be more appropriate.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
-

**Recommendation 19**

**All policies related to air pollution must be:**

- a) Directly informed by the direct experience of users
- b) Reported on regularly including the monitoring of impacts on pollution and user/resident experience using data
- c) The Citizens' Assembly should be updated quarterly on progress and this information shared publicly

**Overall Rank: =19th Rank within Theme: 1st**

**Percentage support: 97%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
15	20	1	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think it is fundamental to the citizens assembly that the participants are updated on the progress of how the recommendations are either being implemented, or not being implemented (and given an explanation as to why)</li> <li>It is very important for this to be followed up and reported on</li> <li>I believe this will keep citizens involved. I feel it will empower them as they are involved and able to see change.</li> <li>Regrettably the Citizens' Assembly (CA) heard too many examples of the previous administration acting disappointingly without dialogue, and regrettably at times, not even providing basic information. Proper information, honest consultation and genuine dialogue will lead to informed consent of measures, which in turn will very likely enable these to be successful. Council needs to take everyone into account i.e. not just the "users": disabled/poor/etc. people are too often excluded, and many would like to actually become "users", etc.</li> <li>Increasing the awareness of the citizens is key to increase the positive actions and choices that people living in Wandsworth will do.</li> <li>Shows openness.</li> <li>Point B is very important to ensure that any compromises between actions and their impact are justified.</li> <li>It will be definitely useful to be up to date as any arising issues can be dealt with quicker.</li> <li>Absolutely.</li> <li>There should also be an explanation alongside the rating as to what makes it that rating – explanation and educating.</li> <li>Users need to know what have been done and the progress of them.</li> </ul>

- I agree with this recommendation because I believe that the more people who are aware of the air pollution problem in their area the higher chance people will change there life style to better it.

Support

- I'm not sure what "directly informed by the direct experience of users". Are users residents? Are we saying it should be informed by anecdotes? Maybe "Informed by the experience of residents and relevant experts and evidence"? Same with the reporting, I get using experience of residents when it comes to negative impact of changes but are residents going to feel the change in air quality?
- Public access to info is vital, people are currently uninformed
- Really like that statement, I think the integration of direct users (maybe reword users?) will make it more personal and hopefully raise the awareness. Unsure how CA being update quarterly, are we then personally expected to do anything with that info? Maybe just one flag there.
- Data is key to understanding the impact of any changes, and in assessing the effectiveness of the Citizens' Assembly overall. It is important to be transparent to encourage residents to take the issue seriously, to highlight what works, and to act as best practice.
- The reporting quarterly to the assembly may be too high a frequently, biannually may be better. It also is dependent on if the assembly exists in any way beyond this date.
- wholeheartedly agree that there should be regular, publicly published, monitoring of how air pollution policies are working; the only reason I don't strongly support this is that I don't quite understand who the "users" are in (a) above – this may need rewording.
- We could add that the policies should be supported by scientific evidence, where available.
- Worthwhile aims, though with regard to c) public reporting more important
- There must be accountability and responsibility; it important to keep users informed so they are involved in the solutions, and can help achieve the necessary solutions. Education is necessary as well, otherwise people simply blame others – for example if someone doesn't own a car, they'll think that the solution lies in penalising all drivers.
- I agree that we need to be kept informed, and for the general public to be made aware of the of negative impacts of poor air quality and measures that are being taken to reduce air pollution.

Neither support nor oppose

-

Oppose

-

Strongly oppose

-

## Recommendation 20

### Air pollution rating for businesses

Wandsworth Council should rate businesses on air pollution as well as health and safety/hygiene. There should be a requirement that this rating is prominently displayed by front doors. N.B this should be done individually, not one rating for a chain. Businesses that certainly pollute i.e. restaurants, dry cleaners & manufacturers should be prioritised

**Overall Rank: =19th Rank within Theme: 2nd**

**Percentage support: 89%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
18	14	4	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

#### Strongly support

- This will incentivise businesses to improve their rating, as long as the rating is shown prominently and this can be inspected/enforced.
- Absolutely, similar to food hygiene. Give businesses a star rating.
- The public have the right to know how their choices are affecting the air they breathe. This simultaneously helps raise awareness of air pollution, as well as encourages people towards healthier habits.
- I think this will raise awareness of air quality.
- Makes people aware of pollution.
- This will give power and responsibility to consumers, empowering them to make more considered, sustainable choices with where they shop. The accountability will be on the businesses and will leave Wandsworth council less exposed to negative views of the public (instead it will be on high-polluting businesses).
- Definitely, there should be more and better motivation for tackling air quality issue.
- Great idea.
- This will have the benefit of bringing air pollution front of mind to both businesses and their customers/clients.
- Citizens know where are good for their health. Business will do better to attract more customers.
- We are dealing here with the effects of pollution on the general public, not as a workers' rights issue, as featured in 4. Since business pollution is likely to affect both the public and the workers, it would be better to have 3 and 4 as subsections of a single statement.
- agree with this as it would help people select safer locations and increase their health greatly.

#### Support

- Might be difficult to accurately calculate these ratings but agree with the idea generally.
- There should be a minimum requirement on that ranking for example business should be rated at least 2 out of 5 criteria for pollution ranking to be operational in the council.
- This is a valuable solution especially for people working in these workspaces which are more likely to spend longer hours in the shop/venue.
- I agree, but would support having specific stronger language on the phaseout of charcoal, wood and other particularly polluting cooking fuels in Wandsworth restaurants, given how significant a contributor to the borough's air pollution this commercial cooking is.
- This will require resources but could be popular.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It should not be do costly or onerous but structured on a way that it is tied to targets to make a difference, improve air quality and address climate change. Just in the same way that if you want to lose weight, it's better to make a lifestyle change.</li> <li>Yes I think this is a good idea although I don't see how it will actually enforce businesses unless the council have a minimum standard requirement for businesses to operate. Otherwise they can continue to be high pollution and customers might not care.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do like this idea, however I'm not sure again how it would work in practise e.g. it may have to be split by type or ranking within industry? Otherwise there will always be companies that look worse than other (higher polluting industries) even if they are trying to be better.</li> <li>Not sure what this will achieve and whether commercial cooking will be a big enough polluter. I feel that the impact of high levels of construction/heavy goods vehicles with skips etc. for domestic properties being extended is a much bigger factor.</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-

### Recommendation 21

#### Tackle idling to reduce all vehicle pollution.

Education: drastically increase anti-idling signage including by all parking permission signage and by all schools and high-risk areas utilising council owned advertising spaces.

Target high idlers with campaigns e.g. shop deliveries

Enforcement: create and increase enforcement by empowering wardens and looking into other solutions - other enforcers or tech solutions

**Overall Rank: =19st Rank within Theme: 1st**

**Percentage support: 86%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
19	12	5	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Drivers don't read the highway code, give visible signage more regularly.</li> <li>Stopping idling is just a no brainer. Really think this would be a win across the board.</li> <li>Enforce, enforce and enforce (not just idling, but all air pollution issues). Recycle the fines into "green" measures, and publish data.</li> <li>COMPULSORY No Idling outside ALL schools in Wandsworth please. Enforceable by hefty fines.</li> <li>Idling is a major problem and education that it is problematic is sorely lacking, as is enforcement.</li> <li>Utilize facilities.</li> <li>Necessary and achievable.</li> <li>Can't disagree with anything in this provided it is not done by deliberately making car driving slower, we have enough of this with the farcical 20mph on main roads. Only in the mind of the</li> </ul>

most fanatical ecowarrior does anyone in Wandsworth drive a car for pleasure; driving is already unpleasant enough.

- This is common sense but will need an information campaign before enforcement.
- Educating people on the risks of idling will hopefully show them the effects it has on their children or themselves.
- I see many vehicles idling right at the entrance of my sons nursery. There is no sign. I see people idling in the parking lots. There is no sign. At least a sign would empower me to knock on their window and how them the sign so they know by law they're not supposed to. The people I see idling are usually private vehicles.

#### Support

- Fine but EV's are more important than this and not driving is more important than EV's.
- People may not think that reducing idling can have a positive impact on air pollution hence education and awareness are key.
- Quick win for improving air quality, especially in shopping and school areas.
- Idling should be the new smoking in terms of awareness of effects on health.

#### Neither support nor oppose

- Idling is bad for everyone, and is incredibly easy for an individual to stop doing. It's just a matter of building the right habits.
- Education – cost implications. Enforcement – is it possible to use ANPR for this purpose?
- Not going to make difference probably.

#### Oppose

-

#### Strongly oppose

-



**Recommendation 22****School buses**

There should be school buses which are electric to reduce the number of journeys made by parents/carers. There should be school bus routes throughout the borough. Children can walk short journeys to pick up points. This will be especially beneficial in areas like Roehampton which are not well served by public transport.

**Overall Rank: =19th Rank within Theme: 3rd**

**Percentage support: 86%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
20	11	4	1	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support this, as one school bus could easily take 20/30 cars off the road in one trip, along with it being a zero carbon EV</li> <li>• More school streets and use of buses. Buses should be free for parents travelling with children to school and of course children travelling on their own. If private schools can do it, why can't normal schools?</li> <li>• Great alternative solution to journeys made by parents.</li> <li>• Definitely long time ago.</li> <li>• Utilize transportation.</li> <li>• Yes, simple to implement, at least by adding public notices around schools.</li> <li>• Yes, other cities have them.</li> <li>• This will create safer routes for children.</li> <li>• This is a good idea if it makes sense and won't add more vehicles onto the road unnecessarily. I already know a lot of children who take public transport to get to school and they go on their own. I suppose this depends on their age and geographical proximity to school.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I imagine this is not as simple to do as it seems but sounds like a nice idea. There needs to be ways to encourage kids to use it/parents to put their kids on it.</li> <li>• Would cut down car journeys.</li> <li>• There needs to be a safe and viable alternative to cars for children going to school.</li> <li>• This was the norm in the past so it is tried and tested.</li> <li>• This is a good idea.</li> <li>• This will require money but must be considered a good idea. Expect pushback from parents of younger children and girls for obvious reasons if walking is involved.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nice idea but I wonder how much this would impact kids that get driven to school, it may only really impact those likely to take the bus already.</li> </ul>
Oppose

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would be costly. Emphasis should be on current routes available via public transport or cycling/walking. Should highlight the schools catchment area as a reason why sustainable transport is possible – “It’s only a short journey, 2 miles max for any student”.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
-

**Recommendation 23**

**Prioritisation**

Landlords including the Council and housing associations should prioritise improving the least efficient housing stock first to prioritise air quality and energy efficiency and households who can least afford high bills.

**Overall Rank: =23rd Rank within Theme: 3rd**

**Percentage support: 86%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
------------------	---------	----------------------------	--------	-----------------

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to ‘write a sentence or two explaining your choice’. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I strongly agree with this. Low-income households paying very high energy bills due to landlords not improving their residential energy efficiency is completely wrong.</li> <li>• Landlords should be forced to live in any property that they deem ‘sufficient’ before they are allowed to rent it.</li> <li>• Many houses are woefully uninsulated and need urgent attention.</li> <li>• Excellent idea and should be a national scale.</li> <li>• Council specifically - It makes little sense that a household must suffer due to the timing of which property was available at the time, if that property is inefficient (compared to someone who is eligible for a council property next in line and inhabits a more efficient property). It is a no-brainer to improve efficiency of the least efficient properties.</li> <li>• Definitely more look at landlords and help they need.</li> <li>• Helping those least able to pay high energy bills by making their homes more efficient and comfortable is just, equitable and a way to win public support for climate change and air pollution action.</li> <li>• Encourage for improvement.</li> <li>• Need to say first that landlords should improve energy efficiency in general, and then add the prioritisation.</li> <li>• This would seem to make sense but I am not sure of the details therefore cannot foresee any snags.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No idea what their current approach is.</li> <li>• Agree this in principle, but needs to ensure that there is not significant financial burden placed on leaseholders in Council owned flats.</li> <li>• What would be the mechanism for private landlords?</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To avoid discrimination – this should apply to ALL Wandsworth residents equally. Not just to social housing. Air pollution is everywhere across the Borough.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Think more research is needed for this one, unsure. Do think landlords should be doing more (and not passing costs onto tenants).</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-

### Recommendation 24

#### Green Days

Have Green Days in schools to educate everyone on the issues of air quality, environment, climate change etc. (with stickers rewards to encourage things like cycling and walking)

**Overall Rank: =23rd Rank within Theme: 4th**

**Percentage support: 81%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
21	8	6	1	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Everyday should be green day.</li> <li>This helps overall education of young people, as well as encouraging them to ask questions about their habit</li> <li>N/A - just think it's a great idea in general. Also maybe something that is already done?</li> <li>Could involve secondary schools. Children could "buddy-up" with older pupils to help navigate roads.</li> <li>Great way to include children in the chancing actions</li> <li>Easy to implement.</li> <li>As mentioned earlier, this would have a great impact whether individually or as part of a wider borough (let's be even more inspired and say NATIONAL) awareness day.</li> <li>Definitely need much more of those.</li> <li>Education is crucial and children can influence their parents in a way others may not.</li> <li>Kind of education.</li> <li>Tokenistic?</li> <li>That sounds like a nice idea!</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Green days in theory sound great, but it's only one day of the year where petrol/diesel cars are demonised. I think a more broad approach could be taken to tackling polluting vehicles making daily school runs.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teacher training packs should be provided to assist this.</li> <li>• I am not sure how successful such initiatives are about other matters but doesn't sound like a bad idea</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think there is an over reliance on using children as the means to creating behavior change in the borough, rather than accepting that it is primarily the adults who need to chat their behavior</li> <li>• Having a single day may be limited</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children are among those who suffer the most from air pollution. Are they the polluters? Do they drive diesel SUVs to go down the road to school? So why always want to educate children and not the polluters? And the headteacher who drives to school in a big diesel SUV, thereafter lecturing children about green initiatives? Is that level of blatant hypocrisy acceptable? The polluters are the payers. The polluters are the one who need to be "educated". And for those who believe that educating today's children, will solve tomorrow's problem, it is a pure fallacy. Clearly we must act now as per IPCC, etc. because by the time this generation of children becomes tomorrow's adults, it will simply be too late to save the earth form the devastating effects of climate change.</li> </ul>

**Recommendation 25****School Cycling**

There should be initiatives for free care and repair of the bicycles that children and parents use with materials provided by the Council.

**Overall Rank: 25th Rank within Theme: 5th**

**Percentage support: 89%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
19	13	2	1	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly agree, as this would benefit low-income families with cycling to and from school.</li> <li>• Yes, the easier we can make cycling and the more we can support those that do the better.</li> <li>• Yes. So many examples of these across London and Europe. Stations with Allen keys etc.</li> <li>• Many families are put off by the cost and hassle of their kids cycling to school, this would make things much easier.</li> <li>• Increases safety and informs children of the importance of having a well-maintained bike.</li> <li>• This needn't be expensive, 'materials' could be determined at the very least to be 'training' or 'tutorials' – Wandsworth should almost certainly consider collaborating with GCN (Global Cycle Network) to create school-age content.</li> <li>• A good way of removing some barriers to regular cycle use.</li> <li>• Encourage cycling.</li> <li>• Good way to promote cycling, providing other pro-cycling measures are implemented. Maybe should be included under cycling.</li> <li>• Bike parts are quite expensive so low income households will be unable to repair their bikes making it significantly harder for kids to get to school and adults to get to work especially those who prioritise bike riding.</li> <li>• School cycling needs to be made safe.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Charities/businesses already do this I think?</li> <li>• Supporting people to maintain their bicycles should lead to long-term use of active travel.</li> <li>• Having bike maintenance/marking crews at schools a couple of times a year would be a positive.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Already in the places, might not change anything.</li> </ul>
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Anything like this will need means testing the cost of which would be an added burden. I would bet that those cycling to school come from wealthier backgrounds than those walking or using a bus, why should the council provide for them?</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why should the council provide this?</li> </ul>

## Recommendation 26

### Woodburning stoves

As an Assembly we were shocked to find out how much domestic wood burning contributes to air pollution in Wandsworth. We therefore recommend a phased ban on wood burning stoves/open fires in homes unless there is **no** alternative source of heat. The council should put in place a buy back/scrapping scheme to compensate those who have to make this change.

**Overall Rank: =26th Rank within Theme: 4th**

**Percentage support: 89%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
19	12	3	1	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

#### Strongly support

- Strongly agree with this. If wood burning stoves are not a necessity, then we simply have to ban them in those cases, for the example sake of the climate, children's health, and overall neighborhood's health.
- Yeah this was a surprising one, so v good to combat the use of inefficient and dangerous heating.
- Any house with central heating can be more efficiently heated without the use of wood burning.
- A good thing, but I do think there would be push back, so again unsure of feasibility. May need to be a wider government thing again.
- No justifiable reason not do this, and would have a good effect on pollution levels.
- I was really staggered at the impact of wood burning stoves, and strongly agree that they should be phased out in urban areas.
- YES, AGREE!
- Wood burners as a lifestyle choice now seem indefensible.
- Enhance knowledge and recommendation on reduce wood burning.
- This probably requires revision to the Clean Air act, so consider what the Council can do in the absence of this.
- Wood burning is bad need to get rid of them as soon as possible.
- Great direction action against air pollution as woodburning is 2nd highest to transport for air pollution.

#### Support

- I don't agree with the buy back. At minimum it should be means tested as I don't get the impression that it's the people that really need financial help that have these.
- That's a bit personal to ban.
- I support this except for the scrapping scheme; education on alternative low-carbon heating sources and installing electric display "fireplaces" that provide some of the cozy experience of wood burners should be made widely available.
- I think these are aspirational goods and likely to be found in the wealthier parts of the borough – such homes will have central heating as well so no hardship would be involved.  
An outright ban might be impractical but no further developments using these should be sanctioned and it might be worth penalising ownership in other ways such as through the Poll Tax. Another way would be to impose a 'smokeless zone' as per the original Clean Air Act, clearly it wouldn't make sense to have domestic wood burners near one of the borough's hot spots like East Hill/Putney High St

Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phased – starting with NO new. Should efforts be made to mandate the use of wood burners? A previous suggestion was to have chimney filters to be audited every two years. This would be an appropriate recommendation.</li> <li>• I agree that we were shocked, but I do not think there should be an outright ban. Educating people first will be better, then see how many people reduce using wood burning stoves/open fires.</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-

### Recommendation 27

#### Low carbon deliveries

Wandsworth should encourage businesses to make deliveries using cargo bikes. Interest free loans should be offered to businesses (like Bike to Work scheme)

Deliveries should be distributed through the day to avoid peak hours and encourage off peak.

Wandsworth Council should explore enforcement mechanisms that incentivise, promote reputational awareness and align with the needs of businesses.

Wandsworth to create and encourage use of distribution hubs for channelling large deliveries/traffic into the area.

**Overall Rank: =26th Rank within Theme: 3rd**

**Percentage support: 81%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
18	11	5	1	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deliveries are becoming a larger and larger part of the climate crisis and I believe that businesses should be given help to switch to carbon free/environmentally friendly alternatives such as cargo bikes.</li> <li>• Absolutely. There's plenty of last-mile deliveries that can be fulfilled from distribution centres or through smaller modes of transport. Companies like ODD BOX already do their deliveries overnight, why can't others follow suit?</li> <li>• Transporting via cargo bikes is faster, quieter and more efficient than equivalent van usage, in addition to the obvious improvement in air quality.</li> <li>• 100% agree with this. No further comments except I think these are all great and would make a huge difference if all implemented, plus be a really good case study for other boroughs to learn from.</li> <li>• I believe this will have a huge impact on roads. I hope this will encourage active modes of transport (cycling and walking) as the roads will be less busy at peak times.</li> </ul>

- Strongly support, but this is a truncated and watered down version of what the CA discussed and proposed. Indeed this lacks a recommendation agreed by all: “all delivery vans in Wandsworth to be electric by end of 2024 [with variable timeframe in relation to size of company]”. Why are all delivery vans in the City of London already electric, while most if not all delivery vans in Wandsworth are still internal combustion engine?
- Cargo bikes are a valuable and alternative way of transport which can tackle air quality and reduce traffic. The council could encourage this transport choice with free loans and it should put in place a suitable plan to estimate the positive impact deriving from his solution.
- Interest free loans are an interesting incentive which could certainly be beneficial (whether in this category or not) as there is on the face of it little financial impact and means no permanent redirection of residents funds. Congestion came up several times throughout the process as a problem – time distributed deliveries should definitely be encouraged by businesses and perhaps wholesale deliveries should come with a levy if between the hours of 8am and 6pm.
- Definitely, it would benefit all of the road users.
- Huge issue across Wandsworth as delivery services have taken off - this needs to be made more rational and negative externalities addressed.
- Does this apply to businesses based in Wandsworth only, or nationwide?  
99% of deliveries made in Wandsworth are done by businesses which are NOT based in Wandsworth (e.g. Amazon, Evri), so if this only applies to Wandsworth-based businesses, then this policy will have little overall impact.  
This will only work properly if ALL UK businesses delivering to Wandsworth would comply with the Policy
- Incentivising these ideas will be key. Not sure if the wording of the distribution hubs is quite right. It sounds as if Wandsworth is to get more large delivery vehicles to come into the borough. Should it read “Wandsworth to create and encourage use of distribution hubs for large deliveries/traffic in the area.”?
- Deliveries contribute a lots on air quality, so their effort are essential.
- Avoiding peak hours may be commercially impractical and not necessary for cargo bikes.
- I agree with this statement as it allows for business to minimize there carbon footprint and penalise those who don't in order to ensure they do.
- I agree with this statement because while everyone loves home deliveries they add to carbon and No2 so by allocating pick up points were minimising this across Wandsworth.

Support

- Could be written better. I’m not sure how point 2 relates to cargo bikes? I assume point 3 relates to using cargo bikes for the final mile? I agree that we should encourage the use of cargo bikes.
- I support this but feel it is too weak. I prefer: “Wandsworth should require businesses operating in the borough to achieve zero carbon emissions by 2030 or earlier” – encouraging use of cargo bikes is great but far insufficient
- These are schemes that could be looked at to improve air quality in the borough – step change – low hanging fruit? As long as the distribution hubs don’t generate more congestion in their area / worsen air quality....
- I support part of this statement. I think overall we want to discourage deliveries but I do agree that existing deliveries should be made by EVs. EV’s still emit PM2.5 so I wouldn’t say low-carbon deliveries are a solution.

Neither support nor oppose

- This also needs to address construction and industrial waste. Strongly supportive of cargo bike use - not sure if distribution hubs may simply channel high volumes of traffic to one area (noting



the social and racial injustice with existing schemes which tend to push traffic towards one area).

- I think this is important but I am fearful that this will affect the speed of deliveries.
- I support the first aim. The second aim is unclear: does this mean juggernauts to refill supermarkets or Ocado delivering to private dwellers? The first is usually done out of hours anyway. With respect to the second I am not sure what is meant by peak and off peak. I am not sure that the third aim is practicable

Oppose

-

Strongly oppose

-

### Recommendation 28

#### Electric vehicles

EV infrastructure should be improved where it encourages more polluting car use reduction and accessibility of EVs

**Overall Rank: =28th Rank within Theme: 2nd**

**Percentage support: 86%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
14	17	5	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

#### Strongly support

- Strongly agree as idling is a huge issue. I also think fines could be implemented with the new enforcement. Target high offenders with fines e.g. taxi's, pull in/drop off locations at schools and airports and shop deliveries.
- I think this makes sense, as we are all going to be switching to EV in the coming years one way or another. We should start the ground work now.
- Need to take account of extra costs ? tax relief
- Electric vehicles are a great option but the lack of infrastructure can only discourage people.
- Definitely, a long time ago.
- ABSOLUTELY YES! MORE Street Light Chargers Please!
- This statement speaks for itself and is achievable as Wandsworth is on this path currently. We might need language such as "accelerated" rather than simply "improved".
- Yes, but poorly phrased and should specify in more detail what this infrastructure is – ie charging points and associated parking

#### Support

- Less cars is still better than just replacing ICE cars with EV's though.
- EVs exist to sell more cars... might reduce local pollution, but they don't solve global issues. Nor safety of pedestrians/cyclists/anyone not in the heavy fast vehicles that are only going to get heavier and faster.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I agree that EV infrastructure needs to be improved, however unsure what or how you would quantify the location to “encourage high pollution reduction?” Maybe just remove that later part?</li> <li>• I have seen more street-side chargers in the plans and in reality. This action is already driven by the demand of EV’s and EV manufacturers.</li> <li>• My understanding that lack of infrastructure is a key barrier to the uptake of EV use.</li> <li>• Encourage replace polluting car by e car but should not encourage to increase e car too much.</li> <li>• Agree however prices are high so subsidised costs is necessary.</li> <li>• This infrastructure should be made more for EVs needed to operate essential businesses and public sector services like large deliveries, public transport, garbage collection, fire trucks, etc.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electric cars are a better option than petrol/diesel cars, but they still have significant problems.</li> <li>• Maybe a roll for central government.</li> <li>• I support this in principle but from what I have seen charging points (except those in lamp-posts) lead to fewer parking spaces – I am not sure whether this is by accident or design</li> <li>• My reservation about EVs is the availability of charging points in the remoter parts of the country should I wish to drive there, not what is available locally</li> <li>• A useful innovation would be to enable a charging point to be put outside one’s door and connected to the domestic consumer unit, however the impact of all this on substations and domestic main fuses is not yet clear particularly if heat-pumps are envisaged to supplant gas boilers.</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-

## Recommendation 29

### 15 minute neighbourhoods

- The development of 15 minute neighbourhoods by incentivising local residents to shop local. Wandsworth Council working with big and small businesses to develop a one stop borough where you can get everything you need within a 15-minute walk.
- Wandsworth Council to prioritise business licences to desired amenities - use reduced rates vs incentives.
- Consult across borough on what would be priority/desired amenities.
- Council to develop enterprise hubs to support local residents to develop priority businesses.
- Prioritise pedestrians through a range of traffic slowing measures & higher pavements.
- Increase number of zebra crossings to all non-junction B roads.

**Overall Rank: =28th Rank within Theme: 3rd**

**Percentage support: 75%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
20	7	8	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I agree with this, as Wandsworth is such a large area, it would be great to localise amenities and reduce congestion.</li> <li>• We have this already though...</li> <li>• This is beneficial to the health and wellbeing of residents, as well as the growth of businesses, who are able to service a community geographically close. Businesses also benefit from increased foot traffic.</li> <li>• Love this both in principle and in practice. I think the only bit that I'd be unsure about is if there was any limitation on car ownership (though I know this isn't mentioned here)</li> <li>• Slowing car traffic and protecting pedestrians can easily be achieved by simple measures, which in addition add more green space.</li> <li>• Those actions are all very valuable especially in those areas in which there are only houses and people are forced to drive/walk (for longer) to high streets.</li> <li>• What is the payoff of slowing traffic? – Congestion? (Must be avoided).</li> <li>• Agree</li> <li>• It's a smart idea to ensure the shops in a neighbourhood are ones residents actually need; we should not have a half dozen real estate agents/betting shops/fast-food shops and no banks/groceries/etc in a neighbourhood, so licensing could help with this. Public consultation to determine what are key needed local businesses (things people now have to drive elsewhere for) is key.</li> <li>• Minimize car using.</li> <li>• Excellent idea.</li> <li>• The 15 min neighborhood would allow for less car use and lower Wandsworths air pollution all together.</li> <li>• I already live in a 15 min neighborhood. (ASDA, Waitrose, Sainsbury's, station, bookshop, etc.) everything a 15-20min walk away. I think parts of London are already almost like a 15min neighborhood. I walk and use public transport. I don't own a car. I would like crossings to all be pedestrian crossings. (Some drivers don't care and they never give way which is also an issue to be looked into. On the 20mph zones – there are some drivers who speed regardless.)</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Agree in principle. Not sure about higher pavements though? Why? I think schools need specifically including in this.</li> <li>• Good idea although people still will travel.</li> <li>• Would like to frame this proposal differently as 15 minute neighborhoods have become too divisive a concept.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are still people who will use the car for 5min distance. Perhaps another measurement more effective like the one below</li> <li>• As above, very difficult to achieve.</li> <li>• Rates recommendation not feasible, given contribution to public purse. Not sure if zebra crossings will support - better to have more sheltered crossings. Agree with principle of having more access to amenities locally.</li> <li>• 15 minute zones have attracted much controversy but there is a lot of difference between a small city (such as Oxford or Canterbury) where the controversial zoning is being set up and what we have in Wandsworth. I am not sure we need to do much, I don't claim exhaustive knowledge of the borough but nearly every shopping hub must be within a 15 minute bike ride. I</li> </ul>

would suggest avoiding the phrase 15-minute-anything – it is likely to be a red rag to conspiracy theorists
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I do not think it is possible to achieve this. People with specific diets etc will always need to travel to access certain shops/services.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Recommendation 30</b>  <b>Commercial cooking</b>  There should be more action taken with regard to commercial cooking which is particularly polluting i.e. wood fired ovens, BBQs and grills. Restaurants should be urged to consider other ways of cooking.  There should be a phased ban of woodburning and charcoal burning in restaurants:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Start with decorative, non-essential heating,</li> <li>Businesses should be encouraged to optimise all essential use to be as low-polluting as possible and implement air pollution mitigation strategies</li> <li>Sell the policy well by educating people on why and demonstrating progress, like cigarette packets, or fines</li> </ol>				
<p><b>Overall Rank: 30th Rank within Theme: 2<sup>nd</sup></b>  <b>Percentage support: 78%</b></p>				
Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
19	9	8	2	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Think this is a win all round – better for health, better for the environment, better for climate.</li> <li>Customers and users need to know the side effect from their cooking methods will affect the air quality.</li> <li>I agree because if people see the damage that their choices are making it will initiate a change and help Wandsworth all together.</li> <li>We know that wood burners &amp; commercial cooking makes up for a good chunk of air pollution and therefore I strongly support action taken to phase out the use of woodburners used in business but also in domestic households.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to above point on the star rating. Restaurants etc. should have ratings that take into account their filtration systems, cooking methods etc.</li> <li>Decorative heating with woodburning stoves in restaurants is never necessary, and more efficient cooking methods are almost always cheap and available.</li> <li>I support this but there should be some publicity about the dangers of this.</li> <li>Agree with the phased approach of this, firstly ensuring no new businesses with large BBQ's are approved. I think the issue with wood fires are particularly an issue where there is no sight of this i.e. in homes, whereas in pizza restaurants one would assume they use the least damaging</li> </ul>

fuels and that's enforced. If not then that should be audited. Employees should be made aware of the potential harm in working in these environments and that should be shared with them on job specifications so that they can make a decision on whether they want to be exposed to the risks prior to applying.

- That would support tackling the issue.
- Good idea.
- The current vogue for charcoal grills, wood fired ovens etc is lead by people who are often passionate about the provenance the food they serve and the environmental impact of those choices.. they may not be aware of the impact on air pollution of the cooking methods and so could be very open to mitigation if it is well framed to them.
- I don't understand the last sentence of this and would guess others will not as well; it needs revision. I agree with a phased ban of woodburning and charcoal burning in restaurants, but with a firm end date for it by perhaps 2028.
- Can restaurants use induction cookers if they can improve air quality?

Neither support nor oppose

- I agree we should look into this but don't know we know enough to make direct recommendations. More monitoring of pollution levels directly required I think.
- This should be more focused towards commercial cooking which is nearby residential areas, rather than trying to ban all food cooked over a fire.  
This also needs to take into account the impact of air pollution from any burning of waste in a business/industrial context
- I agree with phasing out of non-culinary heating using direct burning but many vernacular cooking styles require wood or charcoal burning and eradicating these is neither practicable nor desirable. I therefore support part 1 and oppose part 2 therefore a neutral answer

Oppose

- Despite I agree with taking some action about woodburning, I don't believe that banning BBQs or grilling for restaurants is relevant to improve the air quality.

Strongly oppose

- Enforcement won't be possible. You're also penalising weekend workers.

**Recommendation 31****Solar roofs for car parks**

Businesses with large open car parks should be required to add solar panel roofs

**Overall Rank: =31st Rank within Theme: 6th****Percentage support: 83%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
13	17	6	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In current times it is possible and would benefit them and public as well.</li> <li>• Maximize solar energy usage.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think this is a good idea in theory, but I think a more direct approach should be taken to reducing people driving cars in the first place.</li> <li>• I agree to the extent this is feasible but it should be looked into. At least for planning permission on new places</li> <li>• Should we first be exploring why businesses even have large car parks? Use that money to invest in better active and public transport.</li> <li>• This presents an obvious location for effective solar panel usage.</li> <li>• Similarly, good across the board. No further comments.</li> <li>• I think there needs to be clarity of what the electricity will be used for</li> <li>• This is a valuable 'green action'</li> <li>• Certainly. There is no endless supply of green spaces and greenbelt land and Wandsworth is limited on the amount of space it can utilize. With such vast surface areas, business should take ownership of the space, possibly with added tax incentives. Whether the energy generated is for exclusive use of the responsible business or for the council's discretion is another question (likely the former).</li> <li>• Support the principle of using unused space to generate green electricity - but would need to understand the viability and effectiveness from experts.</li> <li>• Finding new and innovative spaces to add solar capacity is important but other spaces, such as company/shop roofs, should also be considered.</li> <li>• A generally good idea, the outlay of which the companies concerned should be quickly able to recover.</li> <li>• I support because this will allow for more energy to be collected and in a less hurtful way.</li> <li>• I support this because you could have charging ports for EVs in the parking lot charging cars while people do their shopping. More EV charging infrastructure is needed. Also it would mean renewable energy! Win, win.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again, how does this improve AIR QUALITY in WANDSWORTH? This recommendation should be much more specific please. For Example: Use solar panels to power Heat Pumps to heat the business premises instead of using Gas Boilers. Or use solar panels to offer FREE electric car charging facilities to Wandsworth Residents. Otherwise, just installing solar panels will have little effect on tackling air pollution in Wandsworth and will only benefit the businesses themselves.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal seems more climate change the air pollution focused. If the solar panels were used for charging electric delivery vehicles it may be more effective to the assembly's brief. But it seems a huge expense to companies and so might be problematic to get buy-in.</li> <li>• Good idea if they can generate energy, and improve air quality and address climate change.</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-

<b>Recommendation 32</b> <b>Re-imagine parking spaces across the borough</b> Use instead for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Cafe and restaurant seating</li> <li>b) Buggy and bike hangars (free)</li> <li>c) Community gardens</li> <li>d) Shared storage</li> </ul> Communities should help determine how the space is used.				
<b>Overall Rank: =31st Rank within Theme: 3rd</b> <b>Percentage support: 78%</b>				
Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
21	7	3	4	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Very much agree with this. Even if a section of the car park is repurposed for these uses, it is claiming back land to aid the community and discouraging driving at the same time.</li> <li>• MY FAVOURITE IDEA.</li> <li>• This would not only encourage active transport over car usage, but would make our borough a more vibrant place to live, while fostering connections in the community</li> <li>• This is another one where I really like the idea (especially the garden/restaurant space as mentioned before), but also bit wary as a car driver myself, I would be concerned that I'd end up just having to risk parking my car further away from my flat. Also would not affect those with driveways (and whom may have larger SUVs/higher emitting/more expensive cars in general).</li> <li>• This should be for everyone in the borough, not just school and children: what about mental health institutions (gardening is great for the mind), what about retirement homes, what about council estates with usually bare and boring lawns, etc. These measures should be made with biodiversity also in mind. By the way: More allotments are needed. Why does Wandsworth still uses chemical pesticides, when Fulham achieves better results without?</li> <li>• It is already done successfully in other London boroughs, so why not in Wandsworth?</li> <li>• Good step forward to try and change people habits.</li> <li>• Improved convenience is an incentive.</li> <li>• There needs to be sufficient space for e.g. emergency services, but we need more bike storage and community gardens, especially around flat developments.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Utilize parking space.</li> <li>• Don't confuse what are often called 'parklets', that is planted parking spaces , with 'community gardens', which are large-scale gardens growing vegetables etc and nothing to do with parking spaces.</li> <li>• It will help bring the community together as well as improve air pollution slowly.</li> <li>• I would personally like more buggy spaces to park buggys safely.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yes but there's a reason why planners does that.</li> <li>• Gradual reductions in parking availability and increasing costs for parking can incentivize a search for alternatives and provide space to make those (such as shared e-bikes and scooters) more accessible.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Great ideas for the community.</li> </ul>
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is a need for parking spaces and cannot be totally eliminated.</li> <li>• Most parking spaces are on-street and so are not very suitable for this proposal.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This seems ludicrously impractical and inequitable; why should cafés benefit and how will they compensate the car owners for depriving them of space. And why should domestic bike hangers or storage space be free?</li> </ul>



**Recommendation 33**

Support more growing

Council to support individuals, neighbourhoods, businesses and schools in growing their own plants by:

- a) Providing materials (e.g. plants or seeds for green screens in schools)
- b) Planning advice
- c) Teaching how to establish and look after plants e.g. children planting in schools
- d) Consider prioritising plants that absorb more CO2

**Overall Rank: =31st Rank within Theme: 4th****Percentage support: 75%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
18	9	8	0	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

**Strongly support**

- Growing our own plants is a great step in the right direction, but I think a more direct approach could be taken to tackle supermarkets making large scale unnecessary imports of vegetables/fruit that can be grown by farmers in the UK.
- Is it the councils job to provide schools and people with seeds etc?
- Definitely especially with modern glass/cement times.
- Good Idea. However, it should be made COMPULSORY for all schools in Wandsworth to install GREEN SCREENS along the entire school fences around their school playgrounds.
- Need to ensure that households have the space and material to do so. Some houses do not have gardens.
- Plants improve air quality.
- I agree as this provides an education for those involved and improves the community for the better.
- Residents should be discouraged to pave over gardens/ front lawns. Perhaps given free online courses to gardening/planting. Basic horticulture should be taught to children as well as adults who would like to learn.

**Support**

- Good idea, not sure what could be the bigger impact of this action.
- Maintain focus on green screens and planting opportunities in pollution hot spots.
- That sounds positive and I would emphasize the last line about prioritising plants that absorb more CO2.
- Point a) there are plenty of garden centres and seeds etc. are not that expensive. It might be useful to have more books about ecologically sound gardening in libraries. Night classes would be an excellent place to learn but I don't think they exist anymore.  
Point b) - too vague to really comment further. Point c) is good but needs buy in from teachers who probably already feel they have enough to do

**Neither support nor oppose**

- Green spaces are nice but not sure how they relate to the goals outlined with regards air quality.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is not particularly relevant to the topic of air pollution, apart from the benefits of having a more beautiful environment encouraging people to walk or cycle. Other recommendations should be prioritized</li> <li>• A nice idea, but unsure how it will impact AQ. Big fan of the CO2 absorbing plants though, that's a win-win.</li> <li>• I think this is nice - but I don't think it goes anywhere near towards what is needed for actually to tackle the air pollution problem. I am concerned residents opposed to more drastic measures, and indeed the Council, will take this forward as an easy solution. It rather ignores the real issue.</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Should be initiatives by the schools, not the Council.</li> </ul>

**Recommendation 34**

**Wandsworth wide air pollution awareness day to include:**

Education of employers, upgrading/cleaning/maintenance of equipment as per the WELL building standard, incentivise (tax rebates?), marketing opportunities and awareness, promotional space, local campaign speakers, better \*increased PR, special star on their prominently displayed air quality rating

**Overall Rank: =34th Rank within Theme: 6th**

**Percentage support: 81%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
18	11	5	1	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Air pollution is a threat to workers, particularly those who experience high levels of air pollution on a daily basis in their workplace. Workers should have the right to work in clean air.</li> <li>• I agree that raising awareness is a really important part.</li> <li>• Increasing public awareness is vital in tackling air pollution, and having a centralised 'awareness day' that is promoted by the council, would be a great way of doing that.</li> <li>• I think this will raise people's awareness of air quality.</li> <li>• Disagree with incentivizing for a pollution awareness day as the marketing opportunity is enough of an incentive. Businesses that will be recognised alongside Wandsworth Council should first be checked against appropriate criteria to ensure the integrity and brand image of Wandsworth Council is upheld and there are no polluting business that are 'greenwashing' by taking part. This awareness day should be widened across many avenues. School's can take part in this day too with families agreeing to take public transport, walk or cycle to work for just one day (think World Book Day where students attend school dressed as their favourite fictional character). This can even be once a year; with the goal to encourage more frequent sustainable travel. – This would certainly be adoptable at a national level.</li> </ul>

- Definitely more education needed front the youngest years through all the age groups.
- Good idea
- We should have speakers going into workplaces to raise awareness.
- These ideas could be simply implemented by the council and so could be quickly actioned.
- Citizens may not aware on the air quality issues which are affecting their health significantly.

Support

- I like the idea of this, but not sure it'd drive the biggest impact out of all the recommendations. If this is voluntary, i think businesses/educators wouldn't care as much. Businesses already have so much to juggle, I'd worry an optional thing wouldn't get buy in.
- Move pollution issue higher up the agenda.
- Agree with the need for better PR across the borough.
- I agree with the statement as it will help educate the community.
- Education and positive reinforcement is good. But it should be informative and highlight the 'low hanging fruit'.

Neither support nor oppose

- I can't understand this. What is the WELL building standard? What equipment?
- Not sure this is more useful that a general publicity campaign, for example through the Council newsletter.
- I do not know what the WELL building standard is or how it relates to Air Quality.
- As with Earth Day, I don't necessarily believe that having a celebratory day means that we make good choices. I definetly believe awareness is a must but I think through other mediums such as news media, social media, our local GP's, through schools, etc.

Oppose

-

Strongly oppose

-

**Recommendation 35****Supporting people who have to use cars**

Efforts to reduce car travel should take into account those who have no other option e.g. disabled people (including mental health), economic reasons for work, lack of public transport etc

Those who do have to drive should be supported to reduce their car use e.g. by car pooling, car sharing, apps about most efficient routes and/or incentivisation by employers

**Overall Rank: =34th Rank within Theme: 4th**

**Percentage support: 75%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
15	12	9	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I agree with this, but would also add that there could be a way of funding EV's for this specific group of people along with everything else suggested.</li> <li>• Some people need vehicles. Do they need big SUVs? Or vehicles with 5 seats? But reducing the number of vehicles on the roads will make their lives easier.</li> <li>• Definitely, there's still plenty of those.</li> <li>• I think this is a good and realistic outcome, especially in the short term. We have to understand that in order to make any difference to air quality, we have to provide the appropriate incentives and ensure we are not adversely affecting people who cannot use any other means.</li> <li>• We should have clear definitions of what genuinely constitutes having no other option, and ensure provision is made for this group – including helping those who must drive for work (tradespeople, etc) to access affordable zero emissions vehicles.</li> <li>• Encourage need to use basic instead of nice to have mindset.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Car travel is still sometimes necessary.</li> <li>• Mainly common sense</li> <li>• Add supporting essential car users to use electric cars or bikes.</li> <li>• This obviously makes sense but there are already apps such as Waze to give most efficient routes and most Wandsworth residents using cars for commuting will be radiating outwards from Wandsworth in every direction to very disparate destinations making carpooling more difficult to arrange.</li> <li>• Yes and to make them aware of options, grants, schemes. To those who absolutely require a vehicle for their employment/or because they're disadvantaged, to help them switch to an EV.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is important but more of a "best practice/expected" rather than a stand alone recommendation in my opinion.</li> <li>• There are other measures and statements above like more bus routes which will help more with this.</li> <li>• I am not sure this option would be considered by people that need to use their car – it is reasonable if the car sharing does happen within friends, but it is very unlikely it would work in UK between strangers.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would this be attached to the Blue Badge scheme</li> <li>• Again this will depend on the person's lifestyle and circumstances.</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
-

<b>Recommendation 36</b> <b>Motorcycles</b> Motorcyclists should pay to park and be included in idling enforcement. Companies using motorcycles that park in local side streets should be made to change.				
<b>Overall Rank: =36th Rank within Theme: 5th</b> <b>Percentage support: 86%</b>				
Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
15	16	2	1	2

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No further comments required.</li> <li>• Definitely a long time ago.</li> <li>• This may prompt delivery companies to change to cargo bikes.</li> <li>• Same regulations should be enforced for every vehicle cars or motorcycles.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think they should be included in idling enforcement but don't see how the second sentence would be enforced. Maybe this could be researched?</li> <li>• Motorcycles still take up space and emit pollution, therefore idling is an issue.</li> <li>• Assume this is for everything except electric motorcycles.</li> <li>• Motorcycles are a source of pollution as cars therefore same measurements should be applied.</li> <li>• Could be a good revenue route.</li> <li>• I agree with the first sentence; in the second I'm not sure what "be made to change" actually means.</li> <li>• Carpark control include motorcycles.</li> <li>• They should certainly be included in idling enforcement. Tariffs should be less because of their size but virtually every negative that applies to ICE cars applies to them.</li> <li>• I don't believe anyone should be parking on the public pavement (and I've seen it done several times.)</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Parking is better than idling, and so this needs to be about managing numbers and a more responsible approach to delivery driving, rather than banning motorbikes completely.</li> <li>• Idling enforcement is good, but charging for parking, which often occupies negligible marginal spaces, seems unfair.</li> </ul>

Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I don't know a lot of about this but I think motorcycles are far less of a problem than cars.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Motorcycles are much more sustainable than cars, we should encourage their use. Ideally eBikes would be a more sensible solution though.</li> </ul>

**Recommendation 37**

**Access to poorly served areas**

Where bus routes/underground are not viable, e-bike/e-scooter hubs should be established to connect residents to public transport networks.

This should be accompanied by good regulation to ensure responsible use of e-bikes/e-scooters.

**Overall Rank: =36th Rank within Theme: 4th**

**Percentage support: 78%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
17	11	4	4	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Linking transport networks allows residents to take advantage of public transport much more</li> <li>I believe that improving public transport and access to bikes/ cycles lanes is the number 1 most important thing we can do.</li> <li>In order to reduce car use</li> <li>Proper dedicated cycle lanes are missing from the list.</li> <li>Lime/Santander hub at Wimbledon Park entrances.</li> <li>Definitely more paths are needed.</li> <li>Agree.</li> <li>I agree; we should consider dedicating a parking space each block or few blocks to parking for shared e-bikes to prevent them blocking pathways.</li> <li>Encourage to use e transportation.</li> <li>I agree as this will help contribute with lowering air pollution.</li> <li>I agree more people would inevitably use them more.</li> <li>The few people who are directly affect by ULEZ are those that cannot afford an EV and who do not have PT access. Poorly served areas (dead zones) should be connected well so people can move around the borough easily.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support this to an extent but think it may prove flawed. If residents have to pay to use the e-bike/e-scooter, and then pay to take a bus or train, I can imagine people opting to drive cars instead.</li> <li>This would be an alternative public transport systems that could be used by some people (not all) but still a good option.</li> <li>Car pooling should be encouraged by workplaces and schools. Car sharing feels riskier due to high cost, low cover insurance and driver experience in different cars.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Regulation for responsible use of e-bikes/scooters is a wider issue. Expanding the Santander bike docks across Wandsworth would be great.</li></ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This is great idea although no everyone can ride a bike, so the use of e-scooters would be better but again its placing it, in certain areas its already crowded on pavements adding this would add to congestion.</li><li>• Not sure how much of an impact this would make.</li><li>• Improving public transport is a high priority.</li></ul>
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Promotion and regulation of e-bikes and scooters should be in a section of its own.</li><li>• Not sure how many people will use e-bikes/e-scooters</li></ul>
Strongly oppose
-

### Recommendation 38

#### Air pollution in the workplace

Wandsworth should acknowledge air pollution in businesses as a workers rights issue and collaborate with relevant organisations for change.

Air pollution within workplaces should be better monitored with maximum levels defined. There should be a focus on reputational risk rather than compliancy fines.

Businesses and workplaces should report on air pollution nationally and locally. Wandsworth Council, businesses, Chamber of Commerce, trade unions and business champions should get together to research the effects and best actions to take to reduce air pollution that is created by workplaces.

Businesses should invest in air purifiers.

**Overall Rank: =36th Rank within Theme: 7th**

**Percentage support: 75%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
14	13	9	0	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

#### Strongly support

- Air pollution is a threat to workers, particularly those who experience high levels of air pollution on a daily basis in their workplace. Workers should have the right to work in clean air.
- The people at most risk are the people with the highest levels of exposure, these are workers.
- I think reporting is always a good shout, and so long as this is regulated and standardized, it would be of use.
- As above - The accountability will be on the businesses and will leave Wandsworth council less exposed to negative views of the public (instead it will be on high-polluting businesses). Businesses will be able to drive infrastructure betterments from their own buildings, ensuring that the efforts from Wandsworth Council i.e. bike lanes, congestion etc. are closely aligned.
- Bike Hangars need to be more accessible and affordable, currently very few and very expensive (cost makes it a luxury rather than a right). Emphasis needs to be on making new and young cyclists feel safe. Currently it's a minefield of speeding cars and cyclists that both invade space, experienced cyclists also run red lights. It isn't safe for inexperienced cyclists to travel to/from school or work – especially in a group; as a parent there are lots of hazards to be aware of at once.
- As many people spend a significant amount of their time in the workplace they deserve to be properly informed and protected about and from the air pollution they are subject to at work.
- Workers and pedestrian have the right to know the air quality data around them so as to do the containment actions.

#### Support

- I'm not sure reputational risk is enough. Any evidence to support this? All businesses should invest in air purifiers? If not which should?
- Compliancy fines are clearly insufficient punishment for the biggest polluters, who are large companies who can easily pay the fines.
- Although important, I feel this is a wider issue that cannot be managed by the local council. Perhaps Wandsworth could lobby the government and lead as example.
- Yes. I believe that constant exposure to poor air quality is a workers issue now that we know the damage it can do over time. This is most definitely a workers issue in certain industries.



Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• May be difficult to enforce.</li> <li>• Good idea although might be hard and costs a lot to enforce.</li> <li>• More supportive on anything with a focus on construction/heavy business, rather than offices.</li> <li>• Again, does this only apply to workplaces based in Wandsworth borough or nationally? Most Wandsworth residents travel to work outside their borough, so if this is only for Wandsworth workplaces then it will have very little impact on majority of Wandsworth residents.</li> <li>• Many of the provisions are good ones but I disagree that the focus should be on reputational risk rather than compliancy fines; I would support compliancy fines as well.</li> <li>• Too vague</li> <li>• I don't think that unions should be involved. The initiative should come from residents in the borough and local businesses. Everyone has a right to cleaner air, not just workers.</li> </ul>
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I do not think we should actively encourage e-scooter use - they are dangerous both to pedestrians (as they are inevitably used on the pavements) and to users (as they rarely wear helmets).</li> <li>• It would make more sense to encourage walking or pedal cycling and provide bike racks. The regulation of e-bikes/scooters is going to be a can of worms anyway</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
-

<b>Recommendation 39</b> <b>Prevention of high pollution pockets</b> Wandsworth Council should consider air pollution from business in permit, licensing and zoning to prevent high pollution business from creating high pollution hot-pockets				
<b>Overall Rank: =36th Rank within Theme: 8th</b> <b>Percentage support: 72%</b>				
Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
16	10	19	1	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strongly support as the dangers of high pollution areas (in particular young children) is evident.</li> <li>• No one should die just because they decide not to be in a car.</li> <li>• The council already considers similar factors like noise pollution, traffic congestion etc. Air pollution is a vital addition.</li> <li>• Agree strongly that the Council should take air pollution into account as much as other factors when approving plans.</li> <li>• Agreed.</li> <li>• I agree, and would go further to suggest strong examination of the need to permit high pollution/carbon emission businesses at all, not just in pollution hot pockets.</li> <li>• Special regulations are essential for pollution business.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I agree with this as it will lower air pollution.</li> <li>• I agree, especially going forward that the council should vet businesses by their air pollution/carbon emission rating.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I don't know a lot about this but seems like a good idea.</li> <li>• I agree with this, but only think it would be really tangible if we can tie it in with vehicles, as we know they are the main sources of emissions. If we can tie this in (either public transport, or delivery vehicles for businesses).</li> <li>• This will only work when businesses move or are new businesses.</li> <li>• Yes, but again all these business recommendations should be presented together, under a general 'business' heading.</li> <li>• I support this idea in principle but an example of a pollution 'hot pocket' would be helpful. I suspect the horse, if this means the Thames-side tower blocks, has already bolted.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am not sure how this action could be put in practice as very often businesses open in areas where there are already so many other shops (high streets)</li> <li>• Rather difficult to implement.</li> <li>• Good idea although might bring a lot of opposition.</li> <li>• Need more information to vote on this.</li> </ul>
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This may prevent important business in the high-street. I don't think we should be discouraging the introduction of high street shops.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
-

**Recommendation 40****Air quality displays**

We recommend mandatory live displays of current air pollution outside all schools and nurseries

**Overall Rank: =36th Rank within Theme: 6th**

**Percentage support: 72%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
20	6	6	3	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

### Strongly support

- Yes. Parents and children deserve to know what they're breathing in. To hide this information from them is to rob them of agency.
- Strong yes, would hopefully help push people away from idling too. May be worth tying in with education in schools/parents awareness methods. Would be good to display messages on the displays (e.g. if its going up because of idling).
- In combination with an information campaign
- This action would impact the parents and therefore affect their choices in terms of air pollution.
- Potentially not all schools as from an investment perspective a 10 pupil kindergarten will benefit fewer but large primary schools – this could have a huge impact by giving visibility. This should be coupled with a more understandable data i.e. amount of cars down the school road this week versus last month average – children will have a better understanding of how they are personally impacting air quality.
- Definitely must be much more of it.
- YES !! MOST DEFINITELY YES!!
- As parents have the best interests of their children in mind they may change their behavior and be motivated to encourage others to do the same.
- Can't disagree with this though would recommend use of national rather than WHO standards which are a counsel of perfection.
- This will hopefully not only scare parents but children too to change there ways to school.
- As a mother I fully support this. The next time I choose a nursery I will ask them about the air quality in their nursery garden/entrance.

### Support

- Access to data should cause people to think about their actions, especially idling.
- Data for monitoring and actions.

### Neither support nor oppose

- I don't know what this achieves. Do they not go to school if the levels are high?
- I think exhaustion with live displays can set in if they are number readings; if this is done, we should consider a traffic light system that is easy to quickly take in and understand.
- Not sure that this is practicable and could be expensive.

### Oppose

- May cause panic and we can not over worry people.

### Strongly oppose

**Recommendation 41****SUVs and 4\*4s**

Non-essential SUVs and 4\*4s should be disincentivised by increasing the cost of registration and parking - charges should be based on weight and size

**Overall Rank: 41st Rank within Theme: 6th**

**Percentage support: 72%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
20	6	4	5	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

### Strongly support

- No one who chooses to buy an SUV really gives a toss about the environment or the air quality. All SUVs are non-essential and should be banned/disincentivised. Bigger = more danger to others = more resource intensive production = increased impact on climate change = worse health outcomes.
- Most 4\*4s are completely unnecessary, and only add pollution and safety risks to our streets.
- Need to clarify what "non-essential" means. For example, can large families keep SUVs?
- Ownership of unnecessary large SUV's 4 4 should be prioritized in city.
- SUVs are unnecessary in Wandsworth - exceptions could be made for 'working' vehicles or those needed for people with disabilities.
- SUVs and 4x4s are lifestyle choices when driven in Wandsworth. A premium might make that choice be made differently. The reason for the levy must be clearly communicated and the revenue ring-fenced for other air pollution reduction measures.
- I agree, and think charges should be based on weight, size AND emissions.
- Good, but can this be done at the Council level?
- I am not clear why anyone living in Wandsworth requires one of these vehicles. If the excuse is a second home in a remote area with poor quality access roads then they will obviously be able to afford whatever surcharges are imposed.
- I agree as this would help restrict unneeded vehicles of the roads.
- Considering that the SUV takes up more road space, parking space & emits more than the usual vehicle they should be discouraged by extra charges.

### Support

- Agree, except the discussion around off street parking/driveways would need to be considered too – those who can afford 'non-essential SUVs' are likely to be rich enough to have a driveway, and thus we'd need to either factor that in, or remove.
- EXCLUDE all EVs from this please.

### Neither support nor oppose

- I'm not sure it changes the picture much.
- Focus towards old cars is most important rather than energy efficient 4x4's. This is penalizing rather than incentivizing behavior – creating animosity
- It is feature of the car doesn't mean it cause more air pollution from other cars.
- If they're parked they're not polluting. Hammersmith & Fulham Borough already levy a green tax on parking on diesel cars but by default it charges all 4\*4s whether diesel or not.

Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not appropriate as some people do not have a choice of what school their children go to.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>That's just unfair.</li> </ul>

**Recommendation 42**

**Signed contracts**

Have signed contracts between schools, children and parents/carers signed every year which include:

- a. No idling
- b. Other agreements between school, parents/carers and children around getting to school in the least polluting ways

**Overall Rank: 42nd Rank within Theme: 7th**

**Percentage support: 69%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
13	12	7	4	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I agree with this as it particularly targets polluters who are most likely high income and therefore can pay the fines - it will likely not target low-income families. My only concern would be, how do you define "non-essential".</li> <li>Not sure if these exist or in terms/conditions for parents etc. seems like a neat idea though.</li> <li>This will really raise awareness.</li> <li>Will sensitive parents not to use the car and reduce idling.</li> <li>Most LA school have an admission policy including strict catchment area (usually small, not even a 1mile radius so by definition walkable).</li> <li>ABSOLUTELY YES!!</li> <li>I agree as it will force parents and children to follow the rules.</li> <li>For nurseries too please!</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support this, but do not understand what these contracts will include or what power they will have. If the contract is breached, what is the outcome? A legal fine?</li> <li>Contracts/handbooks such as these already exist in many schools.</li> <li>Could be very helpful and engaging with the topic of air pollution.</li> <li>Needn't be a signed contract (there may be some concern to giving signatures) but could be a driving statement for a school that the students come up with the help from teachers. E.g. this would ideally come to look like (this is a fabricated example for the purpose of this explanation) 'St. Mary's Primary School Decree – We will lead by example as students, parents and teachers to make a positive impact on the world and prevent climate change' etc. etc.</li> <li>This might address issues of school responsibility that was not in the previous proposal.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I don't have any experience of how well an approach like this would work.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One of these that I think would be good if possible, but unsure if all schools/parents would be onboard (annoyingly). How would we combat that?</li> <li>• Not use about the 'legal' validity of this action.</li> <li>• Might work.</li> <li>• I like the idea behind it but contract signing is too extreme.</li> <li>• Contract or agreement not be signed, then what need to follow?</li> <li>• I don't quite understand this. Do you mean once a year? If so we already have this for the London to Brighton race where I live. Car free Sunday wouldn't bother me but some people may have to visit relatives in remote areas or drive their children to sports. And it would be a magnet for striking TFL or Southern workers.</li> </ul>
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Seems to add even more work to schools / teachers' workload without probably making much of a difference.</li> <li>• I don't think that this will be effective.</li> <li>• Seems rather bureaucratic and likely to be resisted.</li> <li>• What are you going to do if contract is breached? Exclude the child? Pointless.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
-

<b>Recommendation 43</b> <b>Business car parking</b> Wandsworth should explore alternate use opportunities for underutilised car parking spaces & apply a maximum amount of car parking spaces for businesses				
<b>Overall Rank: =43rd Rank within Theme: 9th</b> <b>Percentage support: 58%</b>				
Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
12	9	11	4	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentives to businesses for giving up car parking spaces or reimagining them as buggy storage, bike storage etc.</li> <li>• If parking less readily available, I hope people will walk/cycle to shops. Car parking spaces can be reserved for those who really need it.</li> <li>• Definitely, many car parks are barely used and would benefit community to use them in other ways.</li> <li>• Fully utilize carpark space.</li> <li>• I agree as it would help better utilise space and benefit the community.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is this private spaces or street parking or something else. Not sure what this is about? Not sure how much difference it would make either. Is there lots of spare parking?</li> </ul>

- These spaces are typically only occupied during specific days and specific hours, it's an extremely inefficient use of space
- Support but would need to be specific when defining "alternative uses."
- Must be carefully managed to limit impact on residential areas.
- Charges for parking should also increase over time to disincentivize driving and provide cash to pay for alternatives, such as electric cargo bikes.
- A good way of discouraging car use, but distinguish from vehicles essential to the business.
- Yes, I think the more carparking spaces there are, the more infrastructure for a city that primarily drives. We want to be going in the other direction. We want to be making it less convenient for people to drive and we want to get people out of their cars with more active travel.

Neither support nor oppose

- Not sure how this would help.
- Not sure how this will tackle AIR POLLUTION specifically? This won't really change the number of people commuting to work by cars...  
Removing ALL car parking spaces from ALL business (except for Blue Badge Disabled drivers) would have a much BIGGER effect, as it would force employees to commute to work by alternative means
- I agree with the first statement, but the second statement is unfair especially when there is no other route to the business so people have to take the car. Or if people are unable to take any other route
- Cannot think that there are many underused car parking spaces! Suggest bike hangers are installed whenever possible.

Oppose

- I think it's a good idea for Clapham junction where only buses are allowed but for other high streets I don't think it would work well and would push traffic onto smaller roads
- Car parking should not be made easier.
- I have yet to see an under-utilised parking space in Wandsworth. Most employees of large concerns in inner London do not commute by car

Strongly oppose

-

## Recommendation 44

### Free public transport on specific routes at certain times

Offer free public transport in Wandsworth for specific routes & times, supported by a funding strategy.

a) Research: What are the daily regular short distance car journeys that can be replaced by public transport? What days and times are buses/trains not full (empty seats)?

a) Create a funding strategy that: Doesn't impact massively on our taxes. Takes learnings from success stories such as in Scandinavia (Denmark)

a) Consider: Offering it during days and/or times when there are empty seats so we are not adding vehicles, just filling empty seats. Creating a bus equivalent to a railcard or connect them. Consider sponsorship by companies.

This recommendation will enable to more fully utilise public transport capacity and encourage people to form new habits (i.e. use public transport instead of car)

**Overall Rank: =43rd Rank within Theme: 5th**

**Percentage support: 69%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
12	13	7	4	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

#### Strongly support

- I think that making public transport free (with the correct funding structure in place e.g. a very small raise in tax), it would be a huge incentive for people to use public transport on a daily basis. I personally believe that the average person would be happy to pay slightly more in tax each year, if it meant that all public transport was free.
- Don't bother with wasting money on research or means testing... nationalise and subsidise public transport. We do it for cars, why not for people choosing to travel more sustainably.
- Complex issues + lots of stakeholders = lots of research before starting to draw up some potential actions. Could Wandsworth "subsidise" a PhD student (Roehampton Uni?), as this would be a perfect subject for a thesis (and Roehampton is a notorious dead zone for public transport)?
- Great ideas!!!
- Yes, good idea, but FREE bus travel should also most definitely be offered to parents for their SCHOOL RUNS, to discourage car use.
- Fully utilize transportation
- Allowing people especially through certain areas to travel free will increase its use.
- I think there are certain times when buses and trains are running empty and perhaps giving people a window of free public transport might encourage more people to use public transport.

#### Support

- This one seems further off, I think it would be good but unsure if possible, or again the impact on AQ it would make. Think there are others that would be more impactful.
- This is quite an engaging recommendation in regards to free travel due to the consideration of public funds and the offer of this during times with 'empty seats'. Should subsidised travel be considered first. Also who 'deserves' this. It may be an incentive if this is offered to car owners – you would be directing them to a better choice and diverting away from the theory of 'I've bought my car, I need to get a lot of use out of it for it to be worth the money'.
- Good idea, might be hard to come to life.



- This would certainly be attractive but how to implement where routes travel across Wandsworth’s boundaries may be hard.
- It could be worth experimenting with a policy such as this.
- This should be distinguished from the previous statements as relating to private as distinct from Council owned spaces. For instance, business forecourts, school playgrounds, church grounds. We are dealing here with existing institutions, which should be easier than residential neighborhoods.
- A good idea but may be difficult to implement, especially for travel across boroughs. Maybe this is something for Transport for London

Neither support nor oppose

- Children already receive free transport. do disabled and elderly. There should be specific buses for busy routes for school children only, meaning less school children on buses. Or introduce a charge for school children after school to use the bus during peak hours, encouraging more to walk/ cycle.
- Is the cost of the bus ticket what’s actually making people take their car?
- This could help spread out bus usage, with the use of ‘off-peak’ times similar to train services.
- I need more information and to see more research before supporting this. I support the overall idea but not sure if financially viable. Not a priority for me.
- I feel this is not an. Easy option to put in place.
- I’m keen on free public transport but needs to be done properly - London wide, with an understanding that taxes will have to go up (for other costs i.e. travel expenses, carbon emissions to go down).
- As long as it’s on the main routes / will reduce traffic / does not impact on tax – so it takes drivers off the road rather than people who don’t drive anyway. So not sure how it would work and routes/times need to be looked into I think.

Oppose

- Perhaps discount at night times but a free ticket will increase council tax for sure.
- Not convinced this can be done in a cost effective or sustainable way. Much of this repeats existing schemes (e.g. railcards being linked to oyster cards).
- This would require intricate research and in the end is not likely to entice many drivers back onto public transport (see also lifts in tubes)  
Beware comparisons with Denmark which has smaller population and superb infrastructure re non-carbon energy.

Strongly oppose

- Innovation will improve the image of Wandsworth Council but with so many recommendations and very basic suggestions, the next few years has little need for innovation over action.

## Recommendation 45

### Appropriate balance of investment

We recommend that in all policy space for zero carbon transport (walking, cycling, e-scooters) both moving and parked should be prioritised over privately owned polluting vehicles (taking account for needs-based users).

Any improvements to car infrastructure should be matched proportionately with non-car investment.

Where polluting car infrastructure is improved it should focus on car sharing, car clubs and essential use only

**Overall Rank: 45th Rank within Theme: 7th**

**Percentage support: 64%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
13	10	10	2	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

#### Strongly support

- Less cars has to be the goal.
- Need to ensure people who cannot take public transport or walk/cycle are not penalized.
- Good idea might improve the quality of the air.
- This proposal is entirely within the council's remit so could be immediately implemented.
- A general statement of this kind – that zero carbon transport, moving and parked, should take priority in planning and spending over accommodating privately owned polluting vehicles – is key to guiding appropriate policy in the borough.
- This should be combined with 1 above.  
Maintain existing green areas and create new ones by turning large paved public areas on streets into gardens with shrubs and trees, while avoiding obstruction of pedestrian routes. Add benches where feasible to encourage appreciation of the spaces.  
Encourage community participation and support through neighborhood gardening groups. Automatic watering expensive and unnecessary if sufficient community involvement is ensured
- What is 'policy space'? And, apart from charging points and spaces, how is infrastructure of polluting vehicles different from electric vehicles?

#### Support

- I support this but think the statement overcomplicates the issue. For the first part I would suggest "Zero carbon transport should be prioritised over privately owned polluting vehicles". The "moving or parked" part sounds confusing to me reading it as the public. The second part about infrastructure I completely agree with.
- Every time a road is resurfaced, cost that up and invest it in active/sustainable travel. Do the same for traffic lights, road markings, fixing of bollards that vehicles have driven into etc etc. Once you start having to match funding, you'll realise that investing in people first transit is a much safer, and people friendly approach.
- Prioritising car infrastructure means moving backwards.
- I don't really know enough about dead zones to strongly endorse this bit but it makes sense. It's the passengers who make public transport dirty or loud, not anything the council does or doesn't do. Good luck with putting lifts in at Wandsworth Common station and remember TFL is bankrupt.

Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsure about what exactly this means? Does this mean investing in low carbon technology? Sorry, think it's unclear.</li> <li>• How is it directly related or measured to air quality?</li> <li>• This is already the case as per the highway code. I am not sure about e-scooters which require a degree of legislative oversight; an e-scooter driven on the pavement (as they often are) is a nuisance and in the hands of a drunk could be hazardous.</li> <li>• Every person has different circumstances and so not everyone may be able to afford non pollute car.</li> </ul>
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not agree.</li> <li>• I do not think we should be investing any extra money (or at least no significant sum) into car infrastructure. While car use is important for public service vehicles, we need a drastic and radical investment in sustainable travel like public transport.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
-

#### Recommendation 46

##### Local shopping venues

Wandsworth Council and businesses should promote local, low polluting shopping venues to residents & promote pick up points across multiple stores like Amazon lockers/refrigerators.

**Overall Rank: =46th Rank within Theme: 10th**

**Percentage support: 61%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
8	14	3	1	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think this sounds like it would work in theory, but it would be good to see the benefits of this plan analysed and explored in slightly more detail.</li> <li>• Will help people change habits.</li> <li>• Not having the right access or alternatives that are step free is a key driver in peers (other mothers with prams) in not using public transport. Better management of bus routes will make them more viable than a more polluting route.</li> <li>• It encourages customers limit the use of own cars.</li> <li>• I agree that pick-up points are a great solution to minimise delivery routes. More things like Amazon lockers/cold storage would be great.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I think this sounds like it would work in theory but it would be good to see the benefits of this plan analyzed and explored in slightly more detail.</li> <li>• This could reduce car journeys and encourage active travel e.g walking</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sounds good, anything in this space is going to be a positive, but I'm not sure how this would look in practice.</li> <li>• Uncertain on the benefit of Amazon lockers in particular (in the US state governments have been burned by close relationships with large conglomerates and bad deals with huge incentives for the likes of Amazon). 'Zoning' should be thought of where there are vacant retail spaces e.g. a village with a post office, a butcher and a greengrocer with 1 vacant space should lean towards business plans for a bakery.</li> <li>• More supportive of second suggestion - not sure how we define a 'low polluting' shopping venue. Agree that making local shopping attractive/effective is important.</li> <li>• Wholly agree but it's not at all clear what a "low-polluting shopping venue" is – we need more detail on this.</li> <li>• This statement is not very clear. What is a low polluting shopping venue, and what does it have to do with pick up points? If pick up points substitute for door to door deliveries, that would be good.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I'm not sure I heard much about this during the sessions so don't really know if this really solves a problem.</li> <li>• I do not think this is a priority.</li> <li>• Despite I believe that having low polluting shops is key, I am not sure that having pick up points across multiple stores would make a big impact.</li> <li>• Good idea, although depending of people's time and capability.</li> <li>• How exactly would this work in real life? And how can success be measured here?</li> <li>• Unsure of the locker idea but support the first clause of this proposal.</li> <li>• I think the first aim is unnecessary as most will do this anyway and the distributor/pickup store nexus is something the market will work out for itself.</li> <li>• I am in favour of 'low polluting shopping areas' whatever they are, I don't find pick up points useful, most of the time they are a pain to get to and the drop off points are full. It's better to use low-polluting forms of delivery.</li> </ul>
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Zoning doesn't work. Properties should be multimodal with residential and commercial business nearby/intertwined. It leads to more vibrant, people centred spaces, rather than weird shopping centres/business parks that people drive to.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
-

**Recommendation 47****Re-pedestrianise Northcote Rd at weekends - apply to high streets with restaurants****Overall Rank: =46th Rank within Theme: 11th****Percentage support: 72%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
9	17	8	2	0

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

**Strongly support**

- In theory I think this would be good but would also like to see how this may impact/worsen traffic in other areas first.
- Re-pedestrianise it in evenings, days and forever!
- Despite Northcote road not being a high traffic road, this is a good solution for people to enjoy some pedestrian only space.
- Great idea to help community as well as pollution.
- Really important - pedestrianisation was one of the concrete gains of the pandemic that we don't want to lose out on.
- Reduce car usage.
- I strongly support this with two caveats, firstly should be during BST/summer months where eating al fresco is pleasant and does not require braziers secondly cars should be able to cross Northcote as was the case previously. I am not sure whether a case could be made for other streets.
- This was lovely and I think (not sure) great for businesses along the north cote road especially restaurants/food trucks.

**Support**

- I don't know Northcote Road but generally agree with closing roads for pedestrians and cyclist.
- Not only will residents benefit from the increased walkability of their local area, but businesses will benefit from increased foot traffic
- Love the idea, pedestrianised areas during lockdown was one of the good parts, loved the community feel and benefits to businesses it provided.
- Apply this across other areas, taking Columbia Road Flower Market as an exampl
- This should happen on more than Northcote Road.

**Neither support nor oppose**

- Not a priority for me.
- It might bring a positive outcome.
- This should be applied to multiple similar roads throughout Wandsworth (and not just to Northcote Road), as its too narrow and won't help 99% of Wandsworth residents, who don't live in the area.
- Do not feel this will reduce air pollution to any great extent. It is more of a commercial boost for businesses on the roads that are to be closed
- I neither agree nor disagree with this simply because I do not know wat effect this may have. Weekends are really busy especially at night and so may redirect traffic to other streets
- A good idea, depending on the street. Maybe should apply only to summer months when people can eat and drink outside.

Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unsure of the benefits if it will only cause greater traffic bottle necks, and will potentially further disincentivise bus use if routes have to be significantly rerouted.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
-

**Recommendation 48**

**Challenging the necessity of driving**

We should challenge drivers to check in with themselves each time about if travelling by car is a necessity.

**Overall Rank: 48th Rank within Theme: 5th**

**Percentage support: 67%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
10	14	6	4	2

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More expectations than just emergency vehicles. I don't know a complete list but certain disabilities etc. Consultation required to work that out.</li> <li>• Would absolutely help show people how much nicer the world can be when we travel differently. Geometry hates vehicles, they're all too big and too inefficient. Obviously people with disabilities, emergency services etc. etc. could still use vehicles on these days. Imagine how much easier their lives would be if they didn't have to sit in traffic!</li> <li>• We should do more than challenge. We should make driving really inconvenient and thus force people into using other methods.</li> <li>• Definitely needs more of thinking.</li> <li>• This is an excellent public message and one to consider a strong advertising campaign around, perhaps focused in part on air quality impacts on children, given quite broad public concern about their welfare across a range of groups.</li> <li>• Yes, but how do we do this? Maybe some suggestions should be included.</li> <li>• A lot of car journeys are really not necessary. Sometimes they are even more inconvenient (traffic/parking) but people have become lazy and accustomed to using cars for every journey.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Believe that this will help, but I would question how this will be implemented. Advertising</li> <li>• As a general statement I agree. Not sure of a strategy to achieve this and it relies on there being good available alternatives.</li> <li>• Driving should not be the default, it should be an active decision made by the individual, to encourage people to take responsibility.</li> <li>• We need to get more people to think before they drive, reeducate drivers.</li> <li>• Good idea but would be unpopular.</li> <li>• Opportunity for driver with other choices.</li> <li>• This is a good way of getting people to check with themselves.</li> </ul>

Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not practical and not enforceable. How would you implement it ??</li> </ul>
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not sure how this would benefit to be honest. Think it just promotes a guilt culture for those that care, and won't influence those that don't.</li> <li>• Not a concrete enough action - unlikely to change any behaviours.</li> <li>• Those people who possess the capacity for self-reflection are already likely to find driving tedious and only justified by necessity. For anybody else such exhortations are a waste of time and are likely to irritate.</li> <li>• Promote the health benefits of walking and cycling. Make it easier. Nicer footpaths, etc.</li> </ul>
Strongly oppose
-

#### Recommendation 49

#### Implement Hammersmith and Fulham's residential streets plan.

Check their figures for equity - who is getting residential streets and make sure it is fair for diversity and low-income communities

**Overall Rank: 49th Rank within Theme: 10th**

**Percentage support: 56%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
20	6	4	5	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Yassss, mentioned this earlier and agree with it.</li> <li>• Designation of residential streets and other decisions must be made with full consideration to the wider community, and with attention to fairness.</li> <li>• Agree. Across the whole of Wandsworth please.</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Common sense move.</li> <li>• A trial of a different way of managing traffic is a good idea, especially one that is considerate of the socio-economic impact.</li> <li>• I think reduction in air pollution should be across the borough and for all.</li> </ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I am unfamiliar with this plan and do not understand what is meant by this recommendation.</li> <li>• I don't know anything about this</li> <li>• Unsure about this one, need more info.</li> <li>• Not sure how the council can act on this.</li> <li>• Might not work in Wandsworth.</li> <li>• Is it fair for specific resident only?</li> <li>• No idea what this plan is, and no good including it without explanation.</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As I have no idea what H &amp; F's plan is I have to give the neutral answer. If it involves any form of LTN then I strongly oppose.</li> <li>I again don't truly have an opinion but I believe that all communities should be allowed equal right.</li> </ul>
Oppose
-
Strongly oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>H&amp;F scheme forces more traffic onto less affluent roads that become more congested and so more idling in heavy traffic, increasing the air pollution suffered by low income residents..</li> </ul>

<b>Recommendation 50</b> <b>Innovation</b> Consider innovative ways to reduce transport air pollution such as charging road users by hour/time zone/journey length, linking parking permit costs to the cars emissions and cost (pushing burden on those most able to pay)				
<b>Overall Rank: 50th   Rank within Theme: 9th</b> <b>Percentage support: 53%</b>				
Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
14	5	9	5	3

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I think that while this will be polarizing, it will definitely work. Similarly to how ULEZ has reduced congestion. People don't want to pay extra taxes and fines.</li> <li>Look at Hammersmith &amp; Fulham residential streets, v good example.</li> <li>Strongly support the principle, but not the whole proposed implementation. Simple principles work best: the polluter is the payer. So big diesel SUV should pay way more than small EV for parking fees and residents permits, for example. But charging by "hour/time zone/journey length" seems way less realistic for many reasons.</li> <li>Definitely a good idea always.</li> <li>This has been done in many places.</li> <li>The cars with the worst emissions are generally owned by poorer people. Tesla owners would pay very little under this scheme</li> </ul> <p>Road charging (presumably by electronic VR tolls) works in other countries generally to recoup the cost of a new road. In Wandsworth the main impact would be on artisans and tradesmen who drive across the borough frequently and who might already be impacted by ULEZ</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support extending the congestion charge to cover Wandsworth and other boroughs near the existing congestion charge zone. This extended charge should go directly into investing into public transport. (shown how transparently to the public)</li> </ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encouraging residents to reduce their journey times would help everyone to enjoy a healthier, nicer borough.</li> </ul>



- Agree with the principle, but like the ULEZ, implementation needs to be considered so that it does not have an adverse impact on the most vulnerable users.
- Oils be very unpopular but is logical.
- The “polluter pays” principle is a good one; those who drive, and drive the most polluting vehicles, should pay more because they are creating more problems for all residents.
- Yes, but we need to consider whether implementation is practicable.

Neither support nor oppose

- This is a bit vague. Not sure what we’re really recommending. We’re suggesting coming up with recommendations? Isn’t that the whole thing.
- Like this but can see there being a big push back if not completed across London/if it remains Wandsworth specific. Maybe one for wider collaboration?
- Similarly to Low emission zone or congestion charge, the point is to prevent car use rather than charging. People will still pay to use, and complain about it. Implement LTN low traffic neighborhoods like Newham council.
- This can only happen when other transport valuable alternatives are in place.
- Some good ideas in here but need a lot of refinement.
- Risk of discrimination. Road use charging should only apply to the highest polluting cars and should be free to low emission cars.
- Need to be more specific.

Oppose

- Although I support this overall, I think we need to wait until electric cars and low emission cars are more affordable.
- Too complex.
- I disagree because some people may need to use the cars and can't afford to spend.

Strongly oppose

-

## Recommendation 51

### Car parking and front gardens

There should be no further conversions of front gardens for car parking spaces. Existing conversions should be charged to reflect it is appropriating the road for private purposes through requiring a dropped kerb.

**Overall Rank: 51st Rank within Theme: 10th**

**Percentage support: 47%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
11	6	9	7	3

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>I think this will be controversial, as many people will be switching to EV's and will need a driveway</li><li>These paved over gardens often house more than one car. If residents didn't have convenient parking on their doorstep they may reconsider their car ownership and use.</li><li>Although this lets those wealthy enough to afford a forecourt off the hook, the conversion of front gardens is a general eyesore and contributes to flooding risk.</li><li>I don't own a vehicle but it would be a much nicer walk to not worry about cars and to look left and right all the time. Some drivers do not give way and are speeding down 20mph zones.</li></ul>
Support
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Ideally parking on private land is better than public land... but converting green space to store a vehicle encourages vehicle use, so i'm against.</li><li>These conversions are unnecessary and only encourage further car usage</li></ul>
Neither support nor oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Retrospective penalisation is wrong - but agree that parking spaces should not be prioritised over green space.</li><li>If gardens are used for parking, regulations should ensure paving materials are water permeable to prevent increasing runoff and flooding issues.</li><li>Contradiction on utilize car park spacing?</li><li>I have no opinion on this matter.</li></ul>
Oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Not sure this really makes much difference if the road would just be a parking space anyway? Just pisses people off. I may have misunderstood the goal here?</li><li>Front gardens should be for green space rather than cars.</li><li>Not a priority. People may need direct access (for example for disability reasons).</li><li>That's just not doable.</li><li>Can't tell home owners what to do with their land.</li><li>People need parking spaces.</li></ul>
Strongly oppose
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>More cars in driveways = less cars parked on streets. Electric car charging points can only be installed on private driveways, so driveways actually encourage their use.</li></ul>

- No effect on improving air quality. Just another way to penalise drivers.

**Recommendation 52**

**Annual Car Free Sunday**

We recommend an Annual Car Free Sunday!! Only emergency vehicles on the road

**Overall Rank: 52nd Rank within Theme: 5th**  
**Percentage support: 44%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
11	5	10	6	4

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to ‘write a sentence or two explaining your choice’. All comments made are listed below:

<b>Strongly support</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents of Wandsworth would be able to see the tangible value in reducing car usage, with safe streets and healthier residents.</li> <li>• Great ideas to let people feel the benefits of a city with less cars.</li> <li>• I would love to see this happen to help people see the benefits of getting out of their cars, even if rarely.</li> <li>• I love this idea although I'm not sure how it would be reinforced unless you allowed public transport to be completely free on that Sunday.</li> </ul>
<b>Support</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I agree with this but would like to see what benefits there actually are in doing this long term. Will businesses simply schedule extra deliveries on either side of this date? I think a more direct approach to lessening car journeys could be taken.</li> <li>• Look at other countries where this has been done. Does it change the relationship people have with their local neighborhood and therefore car use beyond the one day?</li> </ul>
<b>Neither support nor oppose</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A nice incentive. Unsure how impactful it would be on AQ, but a nice community idea.</li> <li>• May upset some peoples day off plans, could be restricted to central London.</li> <li>• Just ONE day a year (in Wandsworth) won't make any difference to annual air pollution levels. This would need to be one day per week (or at least one per month).</li> <li>• Commercial, high street and country side may be different situations.</li> <li>• I neither agree nor disagree because one day will not impact largely however it will show what life without cars on the roads is like.</li> </ul>
<b>Oppose</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I require my car for work and unfortunately work shifts, even on a Sunday. plus, how will this be enforced?</li> <li>• I don't think this is a priority.</li> <li>• Definitely not going to work.</li> <li>• Decent policy but would alienate many residents.</li> <li>• Tokenistic, difficult to enforce and will cause grief when car use is unavoidable.</li> </ul>

Strongly oppose

- Impractical and seems unlikely to win hearts and minds.

**Recommendation 53**

**Carbon counting restaurant meals**

Wandsworth restaurants should use and display traffic light systems showing the carbon emissions of each meal

**Overall Rank: 53rd Rank within Theme: 12th**

**Percentage support: 47%**

Strongly support	Support	Neither support nor oppose	Oppose	Strongly oppose
6	11	9	9	1

At the time of voting each jury member was asked to 'write a sentence or two explaining your choice'. All comments made are listed below:

Strongly support

- I strongly agree with this - many people for example do not understand the impact of the beef industry on the climate. I think if each meal had the carbon emissions beside it on the menu, it would shock a lot of people and hopefully influence change.
- I think this will get people talking and engaged.

Support

- Good idea, but tracking "each meal" may not be feasible?
- Difficult to implement locally only
- The public are free to use this information however they wish, but they deserve to be given it
- I do support this, but not in terms of air quality. I think this should happen, but part of a wider scheme in the carbon agenda. This would also need to be standardized across not just the borough but across the country using standardized emission factors.
- Generally support this but don't think it would make a huge impact on air pollution in Wandsworth itself.
- Must have some explanation with the traffic light system so that people understand why.
- I support the idea but who is responsible for doing the complicated calculations on each meal

Neither support nor oppose

- Is this feasible? I don't know. Not sure it will necessarily help with air quality and I'm not sure our meals when eating out are the most pressing climate change concerns.
- Not sure what effect this would make much difference.
- Potentially complex - and unlikely to show much differentiation between 'bad' and 'very bad'.
- How does that improve AIR QUALITY in Wandsworth?? These recommendations should be targeted to improve Air Quality and not Climate Change.
- This might be an either/or idea with proposal 3.
- Nutrition data may be more critical from the meal taken.
- I neither agree nor disagree because even though it would be educational it may put people off from going and business will close down and so a lot more hate will raise.

- While this is a nice idea I think it would simply be better to ask local restaurants to supply more locally sourced ingredients & plant-based foods.

Oppose

- Insignificant measure.
- I don't see how this action could have a positive impact on air quality.
- Costly and doubt it will change a lot
- Impractical and burdensome.
- This is not really council business and verges on the intrusive.
- I think they need to report on their carbon footprint but not in the way that it detracts from the dining our experience or puts costs up.

Strongly oppose

- I think this will be hard to measure and govern. There's potential it could inform customer's of better choices if they intended to shop at a particular restaurant anyway but could it be taken advantage of by dishonest businesses i.e. a business may make the highest margins from a dish ranked as having a high carbon emission journey. There is an incentive for the business to deceive customers into thinking it is a sustainable choice.