

## **Dartmoor National Park Off-Street Parking Places Order**

Report of the Director of Climate Change, Environment and Transport

Please note that the following recommendations are subject to consideration and determination by the Committee before taking effect.

### **Recommendation: It is recommended that:**

- (a) the results of the consultation are noted;**
- (b) the proposals for Meldon Reservoir, Postbridge and Princetown Car Parks are implemented as advertised;**
- (c) the proposal for Lydford Car Park is modified and implemented as detailed in section 3 of this report; and**
- (d) the proposal for Brentor Car Park is delegated to the Director of Climate Change, Environment and Transport in consultation with the Local Member and HATOC Vice Chair.**

### **1. Summary**

This report considers the results of the statutory consultation on the proposed traffic regulation order (TRO) for pay & display in a number of Dartmoor National Park Authority (DNPA) car parks.

### **2. Background**

In October 2021, DNPA resolved to implement charges in a number of their car parks within the national park and requested the County Council's support to introduce a traffic regulation order to formalise the charges under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (RTRA). This legislation allows the County Council to make a TRO on the national park land with the permission of DNPA and allow enforcement, if it were considered necessary.

On this occasion the County Council are acting as facilitators for and on behalf of DNPA in formally proposing the scheme under powers conferred by the RTRA. As the Order making authority the County Council has a duty to follow the legal process to advertise and consider comments before making the TRO. The Order can only be made with the agreement of DNPA.

Plans of the proposed sites have been attached as supplementary information to this report.

### **3. Consultations**

The traffic regulation order was advertised from 30 June until 21 July 2022 by means of an advert in the local press and notices in the affected car parks.

We received 146 responses during the consultation and details of the comments received to these proposals, and the County Council's responses, agreed in discussion with DNPA, are shown in Appendix 1 to this report.

In summary it is recommended that:

- (a) the comments for all the Haytor car parks in Teignbridge are discussed with the local County Councillor and Teignbridge HATOC Chair, in line with the delegated powers;
- (b) the proposals for Meldon Reservoir, Postbridge and Princetown in West Devon are implemented as advertised;
- (c) the proposal for Lydford Car Park is modified so that charges only apply Monday to Saturday 10am to 6pm and Sunday 1pm to 6pm, instead of the advertised Monday to Sunday 10am to 6pm.

The proposal for Brentor Car Park has generated significant correspondence and DNPA are in discussion with West Devon Borough Council, Brentor Church and Brentor Parish Council to look at the future ownership and management of the car park and toilets. Until DNPA have concluded these discussions it is not possible to make a decision on this site at this time. Therefore, it is recommended that the decision is delegated to the Director of Climate Change, Environment and Transport in consultation with the Local Member and HATOC Vice Chair.

### **4. Strategic Plan**

The restrictions proposed support the priorities in the Strategic Plan as they aim to support the economic recovery of DNPA and help the authority become more resilient.

### **5. Financial Considerations**

The total costs of the scheme will be funded by DNPA and they will carry out any works required.

### **6. Legal Considerations**

The lawful implications and consequences of the proposal have been considered and taken into account in the preparation of this report.

When making a Traffic Regulation Order it is the County Council's responsibility to ensure that all relevant legislation is complied with. This includes Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 that states that it is the duty of a local authority, so far as practicable, secures the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic and provision of parking facilities. It is considered that the proposals comply with Section 122 of the Act.

Legally, as the proponent of the TRO, the County Council has a duty to consider comments received before making the Order. The TRO could only have been proposed with permission of DNPA as it is their land, i.e. not part of the public highway and not owned by or within control of the County Council.

It is important to note that if the County Council does not approve the proposal there are alternative options for DNPA to implement and enforce the scheme. The sites are already car parks so there is no change of use required under Planning regulations. DNPA can impose charges and enter into an enforcement agreement with a private contractor. Essentially DNPA has made the decision to introduce charges within their own car parks.

Therefore, the County Council does not have the legal power to prevent the charging scheme even if it is resolved by the County Council not to implement the proposed Order to manage and enforce the scheme on behalf of DNPA.

## **7. Environmental Impact Considerations (Including Climate Change)**

It is considered there will be no discernible impact. The sites are already used as a car park so there will be no change of use. There is limited on-street parking capacity so overspill parking will not be significant.

The Environmental effects of the scheme are therefore positive.

## **8. Equality Considerations**

There are not considered to be any equality issues associated with the proposals. The impact will therefore be neutral.

## **9. Risk Management Considerations**

No risks have been identified.

## **10. Public Health Impact**

There is not considered to be any public health impact.

## **11. Reasons for Recommendations**

Dartmoor National Park Authority do not have the ability to produce a TRO to enforce their car parks, they have therefore requested we undertake this on their behalf. As DNPA have taken the decision to impose charges on their car parks it is considered that the County Council should support their decision regarding the use and control of those car parks.

It is considered that having the option of utilising the County Council staff to enforce the scheme under our existing rules and regulations, as opposed to a private contractor, will ensure a transparent, fair and reasonable enforcement regime under the County Council policies and standards.

Meg Booth  
Director of Climate Change, Environment and Transport

**Electoral Divisions: Okehampton Rural and Yelverton Rural**

**Local Government Act 1972: List of Background Papers**

Contact for Enquiries: Amy Garwood

Tel No: 0345 155 1004 Room: M8, Great Moor House

<b>Background Paper</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>File Reference</b>
Nil		

ag101022wdh  
sc/cr/Dartmoor National Park Off-Street Parking Places Order  
01 101022

Summary of Submissions

Responses to All Car Parks 12 responses – 3 residents of Brentor, 2 residents of Lydford, 1 resident of Mary Tavy, 1 resident of North Brentor, 1 resident of Princetown, 1 resident of Roborough, 2 residents of Tavistock and 1 resident of Yelverton	
Comment	Devon County Council Response
<p>1 respondent supports and 11 respondents objected to the proposals.</p> <p><b>Objection:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Parking charges within a village makes no sense at all as there is alternative parking.</li> <li>- Believes donations aren't paid because they don't accept cards, there's also bad signal. An increasingly cashless society means charges may not even generate income.</li> <li>- Parking charges will deter people from visiting Dartmoor.</li> <li>- Nobody wants P&amp;D all over Dartmoor.</li> <li>- The National Park is for all to enjoy.</li> <li>- The public contribute to DNPA through taxes.</li> <li>- Feels that the order discriminates against small villages where they should be supported.</li> <li>- This will have a detrimental effect on the Dartmoor environment, driving people away from currently free parking areas, resulting in parking on verges and other informal spaces.</li> <li>- There is no evidence of a genuine traffic related issue being addressed by the proposals.</li> <li>- How will charging 'better manage parking demand'? It will just increase workload of traffic officers.</li> <li>- How much is currently spent on policing it? How much will policing cost if implemented?</li> <li>- How much revenue are DNPA predicted to make? How much will be spent on 3rd party enforcement companies?</li> <li>- Will car parks be better maintained?</li> <li>- Are permits and waivers going to be offered to local residents who use the car parks most, especially outside of tourism season?</li> <li>- Just a money-making scheme with no local benefit.</li> <li>- Will lead to on-street parking causing an obstruction.</li> <li>- Revenue won't even be used to support facilities.</li> <li>- A new approach is needed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Supporting arguments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has no problem with the increase in parking charges on the open moor car parks as it makes sense as there is no alternative.</li> <li>- Believes £3 for 3 hours is very reasonable.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Officer comments:</b></p> <p>All views and comments noted.</p> <p>There will be the option to pay by cash as well as phone. Drivers should take this into consideration when planning their journey.</p> <p>There are other areas suitable for/allocated to parking that people can continue to use to enjoy the moor for free.</p> <p>The charges seek to manage the car parking demand, by ensuring turnover of vehicles in the more popular locations. This will enable more people to access these areas and it is considered that the tariffs are set at a level that will not deter those who wish to stay longer.</p> <p>The income generated and enforcement required is unknown. Any income generated will be ringfenced to maintain these assets.</p> <p>Permits will be allocated to those as detailed in schedule 2 of the draft TRO.</p> <p>Support noted.</p>

**Suggestions:**

- DNPA should issue annual parking permits worth £30 allowing people to regularly visit Dartmoor, but still allow DNPA to maintain car parks.
- Provide adequate park and ride facilities.

Permits will be allocated to those as detailed in schedule 2 of the draft TRO. Alternative visitor permit options have been explored but were considered difficult to manage and not cost effective to operate.

A park and ride is not within the remit of this scheme.

**Recommendation**

See recommendations for individual car parks below.

**Responses to Brentor Car Park**

**86 respondents – West Devon/Brentor Parish Councillor, Brentor Parish Council, 1 resident of Bere Alston, 1 resident of Bere Ferrers, 31 residents of Brentor, 2 residents of Bridestowe, 1 resident of Camelford, Cornwall, 2 residents of Coryton, 1 resident of Dawlish, 1 resident of Ely, Cambridgeshire, 1 resident of Exeter, 1 resident of Exminster, 1 resident of Kenilworth, Warwickshire, 2 residents of Lifton, 1 resident of Littleport, Cambridgeshire, 5 residents of Lydford, 7 residents of Mary Tavy, 5 residents of North Brentor, 2 residents of Okehampton, 5 residents of Plymouth, 1 resident of Princetown, 1 resident of South Brentor, 8 residents of Tavistock, 1 resident of Wellington, Somerset and 3 residents of West Blackdown**

**Comment**

1 respondent supports and 81 respondents object to the proposals.

**Objection:**

- Charges should not be introduced unless there is an increase in security and the toilet facilities are open for longer.
- If DNPA were to take on the toilets and deal with the security then it would be a benefit, perhaps, worth paying for.
- There are already problems with thefts and cars being broken into.
- Will WDBC be taking responsibility for thefts and break ins?
- Money in a remote machine will almost certainly mean the machine will be vandalised, adding to costs.
- How will you prevent thefts in the car park?
- Charges will discourage locals and tourists from visiting the church.
- Many older or disadvantaged people will not be able to afford to visit the Church.
- It will limit access to a place of worship.
- Volunteers will stop coming to the church or village hall.
- What about people attending services. They would be penalised by the charges.
- It is a tax on worship or those seeking comfort or simply enjoy the most significant site in the Parish.
- This is religious discrimination and morally wrong to charge those who attend services.
- Car park here exists to serve the church.

**Devon County Council Response****Officer comments:**

All views and comments noted.

Income generated from the car parks is ring fenced to maintain these assets (car parks and ancillary buildings). DNPA are in discussion with WDBC, Church and Parish Council to look at the car park and toilets ownership and management in the future.

DNPA will work with the church to determine what permits are required for volunteers.

The DNPA would consider relaxing the times of operation on a Sunday to ensure attendees of church services are not charged.

- People have been worshipping here for nearly 900 years and should have the right to continue without charge.
- The only access to the church is a fast rural road with no footpath, so many local people have no choice but to drive to the church.
- Church will receive fewer donations.
- This TRO will have a serious impact on the church.
- People will think that the church is profiting from the charges and will have a decrease in donations.
- Church is a popular wedding venue; they cannot host a wedding if visitors have to pay and don't have access to a toilet.
- People will park on-street to avoid the charges.
- Parking on-street will make the junction more dangerous.
- Parking on-street will make it difficult for large or agricultural vehicles to pass.
- Parking on-street will cause congestion.
- Parking on-street will be a danger to pedestrians.
- Parking on-street will cause serious accidents.
- Regularly use the car park, but will be forced to park on-street, which is unsafe, but others will do the same. This TRO should be reconsidered.
- What will stop on-street parking and obstructions?
- During lockdown the car park was closed resulting in on-street parking, significantly reducing road safety. The crossings and junctions are on hills, bends with poor visibility and cars approach at speed, parked vehicles at these locations is unsafe.
- This TRO proposal ignores the discussions between WDBC, DNPA and Brentor Parish Council. It doesn't align with the plan for the Church to take on the expenses of the public toilets, which it is understood may be subsidised by a mobile catering facility in the car park.
- Why has the offer from the Church or Parish to run the car park and toilets been declined?
- It was verbally agreed the church would take over the car park and then overturned due to this TRO.
- DNPA have not behaved correctly in ignoring all the discussions that would have resolved this problem.
- Concerns that the toilets will end up being closed.
- The church has discussed maintaining the car park at no cost to DNPA this should be further explored.
- Car park and toilets are partly funded by the community. DNPA don't want this responsibility, so shouldn't pocket the revenue which only accrues from people visiting the church.
- Revenue raised won't go towards maintaining the car park.
- If the Parish were to own the car park and toilets, then they could continue to be free.
- The church has begun running the toilets as WDBC and DNPA do not.

It is not the responsibility of DNPA to provide toilet facilities for those attending church services.

If drivers choose to park on-street they should do so in a safe manner so as not to cause obstructions or dangers to other road users. The police can issue penalties to those who are parked dangerously.

Drivers should drive according to the conditions of the road, this includes considering junctions, tight bends, visibility and any parked vehicles.

DNPA are in discussion with WDBC, Church and Parish Council to look at the car park and toilets ownership and management in the future.

Income generated from the car parks is ring fenced to maintain these assets (car parks and ancillary buildings). The Government have charged all National Parks to generate income, to enable them to maintain their assets.

- Church volunteers are willing to maintain the toilets as many won't visit without WCs available.
- It is a money grab by the National Park with no benefits to any local resident or visitor to the area.
- DNPA is putting revenue above the community.
- It is not a busy car park, so sees no need to charge.
- There is no need to introduced parking charges at Brentor.
- There is no justification in the Statement of Reasons.
- The church, land and surrounding area should be free to all for use.
- Access to the church, a community meeting point and valued visitor attraction should be upheld.
- 700 years of history will effectively be closed off by this proposal.
- Without the church there would be no revenue for the car park. Using it to provide income, whilst taking no responsibility for facilities or supporting those maintaining the church is extremely cynical.
- How much revenue will be generated?
- The church is often used for village events, bringing in tourists. This leads to money being spent in the wider community, charges during an economic crisis will deter visitors and have a substantial knock-on effect.
- It'll be damaging to local communities to implement the changes.
- This is a step backwards for rural communities and businesses.
- The car park is an essential good to the community, especially to access a good mobile phone signal. DNPA and DCC are uninterested in providing basic 2G service or supporting local amenities (the toilets which they have been told will close) but will profit from any revenue.
- Reasons given is to manage traffic demand but this is obviously inappropriate for this car park.
- This TRO will not 'better manage parking demand'.
- Disabled persons will be required to pay but motorcycles will be free. Motorcycles are registered motorised vehicles so why should they be treated in a privileged way? They'll park in the middle of a space, so they don't take up less room.
- Motorcycles will be allowed to park free, so all road users should be able to.
- The 'no return within 1 hour' is unenforceable, volunteers leave and return regularly.
- Please consider the views of locals not just the National Park.
- Roads are dangerous with the speeding traffic and people crossing the road to access St Michaels Church.
- DNPA, WDBC and DCC all use the church for promotion without contributing anything, now want to impose charges.

The charges seek to manage the car parking demand, by ensuring turnover of vehicles in the more popular locations. This will enable more people to access these areas and it is considered that the tariffs are set at a level that will not deter those who wish to stay longer.

Motorcycles are unable to safely affix a P&D ticket to their vehicle. Until there is guaranteed signal/capability to purchase a ticket virtually they cannot be expected to display a ticket.

Volunteer permits will not be subject to the 1 hour no return period.



- The DNPA will soon charge for parking everywhere, it is a dangerous precept that will be followed up.
- DNPA should exist to preserve cultural heritage and surroundings of Brentor.
- Devon wishes to maximise tourist revenue; this proposal is contradictory of the council and parks mandate.
- Residents are being driven further away from home to exercise as there are so many restrictions on Dartmoor.
- There are no facilities that require payment for, it's a back door tax.
- No formal discussion with Brentor PC by DNPA and DCC it was only by default that the PC learnt of the proposals, despite having been in discussions about taking responsibility of the car park/toilets after WDBC had issued a notice to say they were closing the toilets.
- It takes time to reach this stage in the process, concerned for the contempt displayed by DNPA, DCC and the local member not having the courtesy to include Brentor Parochial Church Council (PCC) in discussions until 4 days before closing of consultation.
- The Parish Council has a long history of supporting the facilities at St Michaels Church and could have provided an informed input into the process that has resulted in this order.
- This change is unnecessary and damaging to such a small community Church.
- The car park isn't a complex asset that needs much maintenance so shouldn't be made pay and display.
- The car park is well used, rarely over full and provides safe access to the Church.
- Surrounding roads are narrow and well used by large vehicles, cars, horse riders, pedestrians and cyclists, this TRO will be dangerous to all.
- What is the cost of a traffic officer coming out?
- The DNPA should work with the interest of the park residents as well as tourists.
- Some residents like to visit the church almost every day, cannot afford the extra cost every month to park, so will have to stop going unless they park on the road, like everyone else will, but fears this will then lead to DYLS being marked.
- This is a National Park there for the enjoyment of everyone and should not exclude poorer people already struggling.
- Seems like DNPA are trying to stop any member of the public from using Dartmoor with all the new rules.
- DNPA invest in encouraging visitors but don't think about the consequences this has on local populations.
- What will the cost of installing, maintaining and policing the parking facilities and removing fees be?
- How will adherence to the scheduling and charging regime be monitored?

This is not the intention; DNPA are only seeking to charge where appropriate in the high demand/popular locations. This revenue will support the higher level of maintenance required in a busier location.

Brentor Parish Council were notified of the proposals at the beginning of the consultation via email on 27 June 2022.

Notices were put up in the car parks, adverts in the local paper and the Parish Council were notified of the proposals. This was the opportunity for all, including the PCC, to make comments regarding the proposals.

There are other areas in the National Park that are still free to park and enjoy.

Civil Enforcement Officers may periodically visit these locations to ensure vehicles are adhering to the restrictions.

- The church car park is just outside the boundary of Dartmoor and they are totally against it being put into the hands of DNPA who will put nothing into it but just take money out.
- These proposals have nothing to do with managing the car parks they are to make money.
- Greed has taken precedence over maintaining a public good, access to the church and a site regularly used by DNPA in their press material.
- Any monies raised would go into the general DNP fund so that maintenance would be dependent on future expediency - on the basis of observations over the last few years, this would be minimal at best.
- Strongly feel that if this order is granted, it should be with the binding proviso that charges could only be applied AFTER agreement with the parish over exemption permits AND with a proviso that 50% of all revenue be allocated to maintaining the toilets.
- Has significant housing with a lack of off-street parking so use the car parks.
- Objects to the charging in rural Dartmoor car parks.
- DNPA doesn't own the car park in Brentor by what right do they have to seek DCC implement parking charges? Does not list it as one of their car parks on their website. WDBC website claims the Council has a free car park in Brentor and operates the public toilets. Are both Authorities misleading the public?
- Saddened by the proposals. At a time when families are already struggling financially, having unlimited access to an AONB is a blessing.
- Dartmoor should be preserved, free for all to appreciate.
- It is the only safe place for parishioners and pilgrims to park. It is one end of the Archangel Way pilgrimage.
- Traffic incidents will increase resulting in damaged cars, pedestrians and buildings.
- Concerns the TRO is being used to generate income and not to address a particular issue. Understands that in a meeting DNPA Officer Richard Drysdale confirmed this was the case.
- DNPA is under pressure to reduce outgoings and maximise income.

**Supporting arguments:**

- Believes charges are reasonable for visitors.
- Supports charges however believes aspects should be rethought.

**Suggestions:**

- Need CCTV to monitor regular car break ins.
- Lower charge should be considered, e.g. £1 for 1 hour.
- Local residents park here for phone signal and only stay for short periods. A 30 minute free parking period should be applied.

Income generated from the car parks is ring fenced to maintain these assets (car parks and ancillary buildings). DNPA are in discussion with WDBC, Church and Parish Council to look at the car park and toilets ownership and management in the future.

Any decision regarding permits would need to be resolved as part of the decision on the TRO. The remaining issues are outside the scope of the TRO and is a matter between DNPA and the Parish Council.

DNPA own the car park but have worked with WDBC to manage the area.

Drivers should drive in a safe and appropriate manner according to the conditions of the road.

The DNPA has been charged by Government to generate income as they have reduced DNPA's grant in real terms. Therefore, to maintain these facilities DNPA need to secure income.

Support noted.

CCTV would be very costly to install in such a remote location.

It is not considered that a free parking period is appropriate as

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Sundays should be free parking.</li> <li>- Charges should not extend beyond 5pm on Sundays.</li> <li>- Sundays charging period should be 12:00pm - 4:30pm</li> <li>- Passes given to volunteers or those with essential roles.</li> <li>- Passes given to all special interest groups.</li> <li>- Visitors should pay the charges. Local worshippers, volunteers maintaining the church and wedding parties should not.</li> <li>- Charges shouldn't apply on Sunday or have waivers for members of the parish.</li> <li>- At least 30 permits would be required for Church officers, helpers and bellringers plus others for parishioners without limit.</li> </ul>	<p>these vehicles would still be using the car park and facilities.</p> <p>The Sunday restriction could be revised to ensure attendees of church services are not charged.</p> <p>Permits will be issued to volunteers and others authorised by the DNPA.</p> <p>DNPA will work with the church to determine what permits are required for volunteers.</p>
---	--

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the decision is delegated to the Director of Climate Change, Environment and Transport in consultation with the Local Member and HATOC Vice Chair.

**Responses to Lydford Car Park**

**64 respondents – Lydford Parish Council, 1 resident of Amsterdam, Holland, 5 residents of Brentor, 1 resident of Bridestowe, 1 resident of Canterbury, Kent, 2 residents of Chillaton, 1 resident of Exeter, 1 resident of Hatherleigh, 2 residents of Inwardleigh, 1 resident of Lamerton, 1 resident of Lifton, 39 residents of Lydford, 3 residents of Mary Tavy, 2 residents of North Brentor, 1 resident of Okehampton, 1 resident of Plymouth and 4 residents of Tavistock**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Devon County Council Response</b>
<p>All 64 respondents object to the proposals.</p> <p><b>Objection:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Objects on the grounds of pedestrian safety, there is no pavement or street lighting in or around the car park or through the main village.</li> <li>- In addition to residents of Lydford, others will park on-street to avoid the charges.</li> <li>- Charges will lead to on-street parking by tourists visiting English Heritage sites, visitors to the pub, people attending church/funerals/weddings.</li> <li>- Road is narrow and busy with farm traffic, buses, tourists and those short cutting to/from Tavistock to avoid the A386. Also part of NCN 27 which has considerable use. It is, therefore, dangerous for pedestrians and the primary school children.</li> <li>- Traffic passes through narrow roads at speed.</li> <li>- Large vehicles and pedestrians already have to dodge parked vehicles.</li> <li>- Parking on-street will cause difficulties for emergency service vehicles.</li> <li>- Cyclists accessing the Granite Way will have difficulty safely navigating their way through.</li> <li>- They frequent the car park to walk the Granite Way, if costs are imposed many residents won't be able to do this as often.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Officer comments:</b></p> <p>All views and comments noted.</p> <p>If drivers choose to park on-street they should do so in a safe manner so as not to cause obstructions or dangers to other road users. The police can issue penalties to those who are parked dangerously.</p>

- Witnessed accidents involving children on bicycles striking parked cars.
- Proposals will exacerbate current issues.
- There is no footpath through the village, school children will be forced to walk in the road to get to school.
- Congestion is already a daily occurrence. There will be an increase in traffic jams and bottle necks.
- Increase in on-street parking will reduce visibility and passing places.
- Some householders use the car park overnight for the safety of their vehicles, which should be their right, being residents without having to pay.
- Already difficult to access/exit drive due to vehicles parked on-street.
- Objective of the TRO is to better manage the car parking demand, believe it will achieve the opposite, chaotic parking, that will lead to further parking restrictions being required on-street.
- Disgraceful that you are charging for Dartmoor Car Parks, where will it stop?
- People should be allowed to park for free to appreciate the beauty of Dartmoor.
- Residents use the car park instead of parking on-street to avoid creating obstructions.
- Charging will cause considerable hardship to residents of the village, especially with the cost of living crisis.
- Visitors will be happy to pay a reasonable charge to visit Lydford, but those who live here will find life extremely difficult.
- Pub staff and customers can't afford charges, this will affect the pubs recruitment, retention and business.
- They use the car park daily for work, the proposed charges are ridiculous and unaffordable.
- Covid has damaged the trade industry, making customers pay to park will only worsen this.
- Uses the car park to visit the pub, charges will be devastating for the business especially in off season times.
- Adding a £60 monthly parking charge to full-time staff will be crippling.
- Cost burden placed upon already low paid workers in the service industry locally who use the car park daily
- Customers will find pubs with free parking.
- Residents, many that are elderly, won't be able to park outside their homes.
- High proportion of residents are elderly and are not always able to walk and need to use the car park as it is the only safe and convenient place for them to park.
- Several houses don't have any other parking except the road.
- DNPA have not supported anything in the village, tried to get them to repair the potholes in the car park, they said it was not their responsibility.

All road users, including pedestrians and cyclists, should exercise due care and attention to not cause damage to vehicles or property.

Charges are proposed during the daytime only, residents will still be able to park overnight for free.

If drivers choose to park on-street they should do so in a safe manner so as not to cause obstructions or dangers to other road users. The police can issue penalties to those who are parked dangerously.

There are other areas in the National Park that are still free to park and enjoy.

DNPA are working with Parish Council and Castle Inn for options to support staff.

- It'll be damaging to local communities to implement the changes.
- Proposals should have been subject to a consultation before submitting proposals, to gauge the strength of feeling in the village.
- DNPA do not own this car park, neither do they manage it. They have no right to ask DCC to impose parking charges.
- WDBC website claims the Council has a free car park in Lydford and operates the public toilets. Are both Authorities misleading the public?
- The car park was provided by WDBC when the pub was bought.
- Car park is for the church, disgraceful to make people pay to visit a church.
- Lydford car park is crucial to PCC's services, they need to raise £25,000 per annum, charges will deter both visitors (around 10%) and congregations who make up the rest. Some members are disabled and require the spaces closest to the Church.
- The church has no parking, people wishing to worship will have to pay. This is religious discrimination and morally wrong to charge them.
- Car park serves the church and the volunteers upkeeping them will be penalised with extra charges.
- Widely used by the local community to access the church and the pub. The maintenance of the car park is an essential public good.
- The toilets are maintained at a cost 40% of the parish precept, they should be funded by the DNPA if they want to parking charges.
- P&D is inappropriate here.
- Believes it is unenforceable for people to monitor the car park.
- This is a step backwards for rural communities and businesses. Respondent objects to charging in rural Dartmoor car parks.
- Visitors parking are often people using the church or visiting the castle ruins, using the toilets or dropping and picking children up from school (as the school has a wide catchment area). It is unlikely these visitors would want to pay for the three hours, far longer than they are likely to be there.
- Will cause Traffic Safety Issues throughout the village and is a serious breach of Highway Safety Management. It should therefore be withdrawn as a matter of common sense.
- More obstructions will result in accidents.
- When the National Trust gorge car park is full, visitors park on the hill up into the village and make traveling through the village with tractors and trailers very difficult, believes that charging for the car park this problem will be far more frequent.
- DNPA invest in encouraging visitors but don't think about the consequences this has on local populations.

Notices were put up in the car parks and adverts in the local paper to notify people of the proposals. This is the opportunity for all to make comments regarding the proposals

DNPA own the car park but have worked with WDBC to manage the area.

It is recommended that charges on a Sunday will only apply between 1pm and 6pm to ensure attendees of church services are not charged.

DNPA are working with PC to ensure maintenance of car park and also to explore electric car charging.

Civil Enforcement Officers may periodically visit the car park to ensure vehicles are adhering to the restrictions. The restrictions are simple to enforce as a vehicle has either paid to park or not or has a valid permit.

Dropping off for school will not be affected by the charging as the charging does not start until 10am. DNPA will work with the Primary School to consider options that might allow parents utilise the car park at the end of the school day.

Drivers should drive in a safe and appropriate manner.

- These proposals have nothing to do with managing the car parks they are to make money.
- DNPA stopped funding the toilet and the management has now been taken over by the people of Lydford and now they're going to charge to park in our own village.
- DNPA and DCC are uninterested in supporting local amenities (the toilets which they have been told will close) but will profit from any revenue. Greed has taken precedence over maintaining a public good, access to the church and the last pub in the immediate area.
- Lydford is completely different to other car parks as they are for leisure and visitors, Lydford serves the community.
- Lydford is considered one of the most important archaeological sites on Dartmoor, so the last thing wanted is to clog it up with parked cars. Apart from the traffic chaos that will be created, the visual and environmental effect will be disastrous.
- Will DNPA take over maintenance of the toilets?
- Cost to build private parking for the pub would be 3 times what all the workers will be paying a month to park in the one already there, which isn't big enough for everyone visiting the surroundings.
- Motorcycles will be allowed to park free, so all road users should be able to.
- DCC and DNPA will knowingly accept the risks that are created for what is only a modest income which won't be used to reduce any of the risks. This is against H&S regulations and not worth it. Appreciates that councils are under pressure, but penalising the local community is not the way forward.
- The DNPAs plan is a major step towards urbanisation, which they're opposed to. Lydford site is the only one in a village centre, so should be reconsidered.

**Suggestions:**

- A risk assessment should be done of the car park and surrounding areas.
- Parking should be free on Sundays.
- Could there please be some sort of compromise for villagers and people that work in the village?
- Residents and staff (of the pub) should get a permit as there is not anywhere else for them to park.
- Donations box instead.
- Lydford should be 20mph.

Income generated from the car parks is ring fenced to maintain these assets (car parks and ancillary buildings). The Government have charged all National Parks to generate income, to enable them to maintain their assets.

The archaeological significance of Lydford would not be affected by vehicles parked on-street.

Motorcycles are unable to safely affix a P&D ticket to their vehicle. Until there is guaranteed signal/capability to purchase a ticket virtually they cannot be expected to display a ticket.

It is recommended that charges on a Sunday will only apply between 1pm and 6pm to ensure attendees of church services are not charged.

DNPA are working with Parish Council and Castle Inn for options to support staff.

A 20mph limit is not within the remit of this scheme.

**Recommendation**

It is recommended that the proposals are relaxed to Monday to Saturday 10am to 6pm and Sunday 1pm to 6pm.

**Responses to Meldon Reservoir Car Park****2 respondents – 1 resident of Plymouth and 1 resident of Roborough**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Devon County Council Response</b>
<p>1 respondent supports and 1 respondent objects to the proposals.</p> <p><b>Objection:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Saddened by the proposals. At a time when families are already struggling financially, having unlimited access to an AONB is a blessing.</li> <li>- Dartmoor should be preserved, free for all to appreciate.</li> </ul> <p><b>Supporting arguments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Believes £3 for 3 hours is very reasonable.</li> </ul> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The approach road to Meldon Reservoir car park is in poor condition and requires resurfacing.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Officer comments:</b></p> <p>All views and comments noted.</p> <p>There are other areas in the National Park that are still free to park and enjoy.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Potholes and other issues on the highway can be reported via the County Council's <a href="#">website</a>.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>	

**Responses to Postbridge Car Park****2 respondents – 1 resident of Princetown and 1 resident of Plymouth**

<b>Comment</b>	<b>Devon County Council Response</b>
<p>2 respondents object to the proposals.</p> <p><b>Objection:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- When parking charges were first introduced with voluntary payments, we were told this would not have any effect on the village. This was completely wrong, and we saw an increase in parking on the roads of the village.</li> <li>- Increase to £3 will make this situation worse.</li> <li>- Additional cars make it hard for residents to park outside their own house, but due to the narrowness of some roads, vehicles are actually parking on the pavement either wholly or partially making life with a wheelchair or pushchair really hard.</li> <li>- Dangerous for children crossing.</li> <li>- Cars parked have also suffered damage from other cars squeezing past.</li> <li>- At a time when the park want to increase the number of visitors to the moor this is a bad option.</li> <li>- Out on the open moor it makes sense as there is no alternative but within a village it makes no sense at all.</li> <li>- Saddened by the proposals. At a time when families are already struggling financially, having unlimited access to an AONB is a blessing.</li> <li>- Dartmoor should be preserved, free for all to appreciate.</li> <li>-</li> </ul>	<p><b>Officer comments:</b></p> <p>All views and comments noted.</p> <p>Local Authorities do not have a responsibility to provide residential parking it is the vehicle owner's responsibility.</p> <p>£3 to park all day is not an unreasonable fee.</p> <p>If drivers choose to park on-street they should do so in a safe manner so as not to cause obstructions or dangers to other road users. The police can issue penalties to those who are parked dangerously.</p> <p>There are other areas in the National Park that are still free to park and enjoy.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>	

## Responses to Princetown Car Park

2 respondents – 1 resident of Princetown and 1 resident of Roborough

Comment	Devon County Council Response
<p>2 respondents object to the proposals.</p> <p><b>Objection:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- When parking charges were first introduced with voluntary payments, we were told this would not have any effect on the village. This was completely wrong, and we saw an increase in parking on the roads of the village.</li><li>- Increase to £3 will make this situation worse.</li><li>- Additional cars make it hard for residents to park outside their own house, but due to the narrowness of some roads vehicles are actually parking on the pavement either wholly or partially making life with a wheelchair or pushchair really hard.</li><li>- Dangerous for children crossing.</li><li>- Cars parked have also suffered damage from other cars squeezing past.</li><li>- At a time when the park want to increase the number of visitors to the moor this is a bad option.</li><li>- Out on the open moor it makes sense as there is no alternative but within a village it makes no sense at all.</li><li>- Saddened by the proposals. At a time when families are already struggling financially, having unlimited access to an AONB is a blessing.</li><li>- Dartmoor should be preserved, free for all to appreciate.</li></ul> <p><b>Supporting arguments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Believes £3 for 3 hours is very reasonable.</li></ul> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- The approach road to Princetown car park is in poor condition and requires resurfacing.</li></ul>	<p><b>Officer comments:</b></p> <p>All views and comments noted.</p> <p>Local Authorities do not have a responsibility to provide residential parking it is the vehicle owner's responsibility.</p> <p>£3 to park all day is not an unreasonable fee.</p> <p>If drivers choose to park on-street they should do so in a safe manner so as not to cause obstructions or dangers to other road users. The police can issue penalties to those who are parked dangerously.</p> <p>There are other areas in the National Park that are still free to park and enjoy.</p> <p>Support noted.</p> <p>Potholes and other issues on the highway can be reported via the County Council's <a href="#">website</a>.</p>
<p><b>Recommendation</b></p> <p>It is recommended that the proposals are implemented as advertised.</p>	