CET/24/17 Cabinet 13 March 2024

Delivery of Parking Management Policy – New Pay & Display Schemes Report of the Director of Climate Change, Environment and Transport

Please note that the following recommendations are subject to consideration and determination by the Cabinet (and confirmation under the provisions of the Council's Constitution) before taking effect.

1) Recommendation

That the Cabinet be asked to:

- (a) Recognise the benefits of identifying through the consultation the need to address the complex parking issues identified in the communities and the differing impacts on business and residents at varying times of the years.
- (b) Not proceed with the proposals for pay and display parking in the towns of Braunton, Crediton, Dartmouth, Honiton, Okehampton, Salcombe, Sidmouth and Tavistock.
- (c) Invite proposals from the communities on how they would wish to address their parking issues so that joint sustainable solutions can be developed in the future.

2) Background

Pay & display (P&D) is often used to manage on-street parking opportunities for traffic visiting our key communities. Tariffs are set to assist in managing parking stock, to minimise congestion and assist in ensuring the right parking opportunities are available to support town centres.

In November 2022 a revised Policy was presented to Cabinet outlining the proposed approach to parking management. The report also identified 8 communities (Braunton, Crediton, Dartmouth, Honiton, Okehampton, Salcombe, Sidmouth and Tavistock) where parking restrictions should be reviewed. A copy of the Policy is included in Appendix 1.

This report provides an update of work undertaken in the past year along with the outcome of the formal advertising process for new traffic orders for those 8 communities.

3) Proposal

Schemes have been developed and advertised for the 8 communities identified in the November 2022 report.

Details of the proposals for the 8 communities are attached at Appendix 2 and shown on the plans contained in the supplementary information to this report.

4) Options

The following alternative options have been considered:

Option A: Implement the schemes as advertised

Option B: Modify proposals based on feedback through the consultation process.

There has been significant objection to the principle of new pay & display registered across all communities, and therefore to implement the schemes as advertised would not be listening to the concerns of the communities. Therefore, Option A was rejected as a potential solution.

There have been no comments received through the consultation process that identifies specific changes (such as times of operation or changes to streets / areas being considered) that would allow the proposals to be modified to better suit the needs of communities. As a consequence, Option B was rejected as a current solution. However, within the comments received there is evidence of parking problems within the communities and as such if/when communities identify potential solutions, these could be considered at a future date.

5) Consultations

Following the resolution to adopt the Policy at Cabinet in November 2022, officers have engaged with community representatives to develop proposals. These meetings were held between July and September 2023.

Braunton, Crediton, Dartmouth, Honiton, Okehampton, and Tavistock Town Councils expressed that they were unable to support proposals presented to them.

On 5th October a letter was sent to Councillor Stuart Hughes, from Tavistock Town Council, on behalf of those Town Councils requesting that formal consultation be deferred and that evidence supporting County Policy was presented.

In November officers met again with Town Council representatives in a meeting chaired by Devon Association of Local Councils (DALC), the community's concerns were discussed, and officers committed to providing evidence as had been requested (see Appendix 3).

Discussions with Salcombe Town Council allowed a comprehensive scheme to be developed with the intention of addressing parking issues throughout the community. This included new restrictions advertised at North.

It is a legal requirement to consult the public by advertising proposals for a minimum of 21 days, due to the Christmas period proposals were advertised for 31 days. Proposals were advertised during the following periods:

Braunton 7th December 2023 – 7th January 2024
Crediton 7th December 2023 – 7th January 2024
Dartmouth 7th December 2023 – 8th January 2024
Honiton 6th December 2023 – 7th January 2024
Okehampton 7th December 2023 – 7th January 2024
Salcombe 14th December 2023 – 25th January 2024
Sidmouth 15th December 2023 – 14th January 2024
Tavistock 7th December 2023 – 7th January 2024

During the advertising period 5,323 representations were received in total. These are summarised by community below:

Community	Total	Support	Opposed	Neutral
		Number	Number	Number
Braunton	181	5	175	1
Crediton	200	6	194	0
Dartmouth	831	39	792	0
Honiton	477	3	474	0
Okehampton	697	6	691	0
Salcombe	31	1	30	0
Sidmouth	175	15	160	0
Tavistock	2731	24	2707	0

It is important to note that all affected Town Councils engaged with the consultation process, but only Salcombe was able to offer their support. Braunton, Crediton, Dartmouth Honiton, Okehampton, and Tavistock Town Councils have had objections to the proposals throughout the process.

During the formal consultation process (in the period between 7th December and 25th January depending on community) Braunton, Crediton, Honiton, Okehampton, and Tavistock Town Councils have formally objected to the proposals advertised.

Local elected County Councillors were engaged in conversation throughout the informal and formal consultation period. During the formal consultation process Councillor's provided feedback and the feedback was taken into account.

An objection was received from West Devon Borough Council.

No comments have been received from other statutory consultees, such as Police, Fire, Ambulance services.

The comments received from all respondents to the consultation have been carefully considered. The full summary of all comments received for each community is included in Appendix 4. Where appropriate some comments, if very similar, have been grouped together, so the scale of what people are objecting to can be easily seen. It is believed that every comment has been included.

The key themes raised are as follows:

- Impact on High Street & Business (2918, 55%)
- Existing Restrictions are effective (1146, 21%)
- Proposals are designed to generate an income for the County Council
- Impact on availability of parking for workers

Additionally, a petition of over 3,000 signatures was received from Dartmouth Against Metered Parking (DAMP) on the 22nd December. In addition to the details required for a petition (Name and Address) there was opportunity for each signatory to add their comments in relation to the proposals. In total 1,579 signatories chose to provide additional comments which have been summarised in Appendix 5. The key themes of those comments aligned with comments received through the advertising process, these are summarised above and in Appendix 4. In line with the Devon County Council petition scheme this will be considered as part of this report.

A petition was also received at Council on 15th February against the introduction of Pay & Display in Crediton. At the time of writing this report, an analysis of the content has not been possible, a verbal update will be given to Cabinet.

6) Strategic Plan

The recommendation aligns with the 'Best Place' Strategic Plan 2021 – 2025, as this provides a commitment to being a Trusted Council, that leads and collaborates well and makes good decisions.

7) Financial Considerations

The introduction of pay & display is not designed to create an income but to influence travel and parking choices, and as such there are no financial implications associated with the recommendation.

8) Legal Considerations

The statutory consultation has been carried out in line with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. This includes a public notice placed in the local press and statutory bodies (e.g. emergency services) being notified of the proposals. It is a legal requirement to advertise proposals for 21 days, due to the Christmas period, proposals have been advertised for 31 days.

When making a legal 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, to secure the expeditious, convenient, and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrians and cyclists) and provision of parking facilities.

When considering the application of on-street charges legislation (Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, Section 45) directs that Authorities shall have regard for: -

- the need for maintaining the free movement of traffic, i.e. congestion management
- the need for maintaining reasonable access to premises, i.e. turnover and availability of on-street parking places
- the extent to which off-street parking accommodation, is available, i.e. promoting use of existing off-street car parks

The Council has considered these issues throughout all stages of this project, however significant objections have been received to the proposals that were advertised, and therefore the recommendation is the proposals are not progressed and therefore the legal order is not made.

9) Environmental Impact Considerations (Including Climate Change, Sustainability and Socio-economic)

The introduction of new traffic management schemes (including pay & display) encourages use of longer stay car parks, reducing the recirculation of traffic; minimising traffic congestion and improving air quality, so the potential environmental benefits of implementing the advertised proposals will not be achieved.

Concerns have been raised by respondents to the consultation regarding the impact of the advertised proposals on Devon's historic streetscapes, conservation and world heritage area by the introduction of pay and display machines. Not proceeding with the advertised proposals, removes these concerns.

There are no clear findings nationally or detailed studies that show a correlation with the economic performance of a community and pay & display; it is fair to say that narrative is varied and inconclusive.

10) Equality Considerations

Where relevant to the decision, the Equality Act 2010 Public Sector Equality Duty requires decision makers to give due regard to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other prohibited conduct;
- advance equality by encouraging participation, removing disadvantage, taking account of disabilities and meeting people's needs; and
- foster good relations between people by tackling prejudice and promoting understanding.

taking account of age, disability, race/ethnicity (includes Gypsies and Travellers), gender and gender identity, religion and belief, sexual orientation, pregnant women/ new and breastfeeding mothers, marriage/civil partnership status in coming to a decision, a decision maker may also consider other relevant factors such as caring responsibilities, rural isolation or socio-economic disadvantage.

In progressing these proposals, an Impact Assessment has been prepared taking into account the above requirements and circulated separately to Cabinet Members. This is available alongside this Report on the Council's website at: New Pay and Display Schemes

<u>Impact Assessment - October 2022 - Impact Assessment (devon.gov.uk)</u>, which Members will need to consider for the purposes of this item.

11) Risk Management Considerations

The proposals have been assessed and all necessary safeguards or actions have been taken/included to safeguard the Council's position.

12) Summary / Conclusions / Reasons for Recommendations

It is important that the authority applies the correct parking restrictions in order to manage traffic in Devon's communities and ensure effective and sustainable parking enforcement; to encourage use of longer stay car parks, reducing the recirculation of traffic; minimising traffic congestion and improving air quality. Additionally, not proceeding with the proposals does not provide the efficiency of enforcement which would benefit other parts of the communities, as well as assisting in the problems of vehicles overstaying the time limits.

It is also important that the Council recognises the significant level of objections that have been received and it is therefore recommended that proposals are not implemented.

Meg Booth

Director of Climate Change, Environment and Transport

Electoral Divisions: All

Cabinet Member for Highway Management: Councillor Stuart Hughes

Local Government Act 1972: List of background papers

Nil

Contact for enquiries:

Name: Chris Rook

Telephone: 01392 383000

Address: County Hall, Exeter EX2 4QD

Delivery of Parking Management Policy - New Pay & Display Schemes - Final

Appendix 1 to CET/24/17 - Policy - Parking Management in Communities

To effectively manage traffic visiting our key communities pay & display is often used to manage on-street parking opportunities. Tariffs are set to assist in managing parking stock effectively, to minimise congestion and assist in ensuring the right parking opportunities are available to support town centres.

It is helpful to ensure that tariffs for longer stays (of more than an hour) are at least equal or higher than equivalent off-street tariffs to encourage parking in longer stay car parks, reducing the recirculation of traffic; minimising traffic congestion and improving air quality. On street shorter stays / higher turnover will be encouraged to increase footfall for businesses.

To maintain a high quality streetscape and reduce capital and revenue costs, cashless parking options will be promoted. This will mean that promotion of telephone and app based payment will be promoted rather than physical machines being installed where appropriate. Existing schemes may also be reviewed to remove machines, reducing costs and improving streetscape where appropriate.

This Policy position aligns with the Authority's Strategic Plan 2021-2025 to address climate change; by reducing carbon emissions and encouraging sustainable lifestyles whilst continuing to support economic activity. The Policy position also aligns with the Local Transport Plan.

The following factors will be considered when prioritising communities for review:

1. Need

The busiest areas of our communities will be prioritised for review, for example town centre or seafront locations. These locations are more likely to be affected by congestion and recirculation of traffic looking for parking opportunities.

Where reviews are carried out there will normally be alternative off-street parking opportunities, tariffs will be set to encourage the use of these for longer stays (over 1 hour).

2. Economy

The local economy will be considered when prioritising schemes. Busier and less-deprived communities will be prioritised and consideration will be given to the Deprivation Index for that area. Retail vacancy rates will be low (below national average), and not in significant decline. These locations are more likely to have more traffic and footfall needing improved management of traffic and parking.

3. Design

Areas that do not already have (or have very little) pay & display will be prioritised.

New schemes will focus on the conversion of existing limited waiting restrictions to pay & display, typically there will be no change to hours / days of operation, or maximum stay.

A free parking period (20 or 30 minutes) will be considered where appropriate to encourage shorter stays, high turnover and improve availability of parking opportunities in high street locations.

Cashless options (pay by phone / app) will be promoted and removal of physical machines will be considered where appropriate.

In all schemes existing national exemptions for Blue Badge Holders would apply allowing free parking as close as possible to the blue badge holders destination. Along with Health & Care Worker permits for those delivering care to residents in central areas.

Appendix 2 to CET/23/17 - Details of Restrictions Proposed in Each Community

Existing Restrictions	Proposed Restrictions	Roads Affected
Braunton		
Limited Waiting 9am-6pm 1 Hour No Return Within 2 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Braunton A) 9am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours 80p (Max Stay 2 Hours)	Exeter Road
Taxi Rank (1 bay)	Taxi Rank (2 bays)	Exeter Road
Disabled Badge Holders Only At Any Time (1 bay)	Disabled Badge Holders Only At Any Time (1 bay) (amended location)	Exeter Road
Crediton		
Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm 45 Minutes No Return Within 2 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Crediton A) Mon- Sat excl Bank Hols 8am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours £1.50 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	High Street Market Street North Street Parliament Street Searle Street St Saviours Way
Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm 2 Hours No Return Within 4 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Crediton A) Mon- Sat excl Bank Hols 8am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours £1.50 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	Town Park
Loading Only Mon-Sat 8am-2pm	Loading Only Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols 8am-6pm	High Street
Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 2pm-6pm 45 Minutes No Return Within 2 Hours	OR Pay & Display (Tariff Crediton A) Mon- Sat excl Bank Hols 8am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours £1.50 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	
Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm 45 Minutes No Return Within 2 Hours	Limited Waiting Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols 8am-6pm 45 Minutes No Return Within 2 Hours	Belle Parade St Lawrence Green
Loading Only Mon-Fri 8am-2pm	Loading Only Mon-Fri excl Bank Hols 8am-2pm	Landscore
Limited Waiting Mon-Fri 2pm-6pm and Sat 8am-6pm 30 Minutes No Return Within 2 Hours	Limited Waiting Mon-Fri excl Bank Hols 2pm-6pm 30 Minutes No Return Within 2 Hours	

Existing Restrictions	Proposed Restrictions	Roads Affected
Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm 30 Minutes No Return Within 2 Hours	Limited Waiting Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols 8am-6pm 45 Minutes No Return Within 2 Hours	High Street Landscore
Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm 45 Minutes No Return Within 2 Hours	Unrestricted Parking (Restriction Revoked)	Union Road
Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm 45 Minutes No Return Within 45 Minutes	Limited Waiting Mon-Sat excl Bank Hols 8am-6pm 45 Minutes No Return Within 45 Minutes	East Street
Dartmouth		
Limited Waiting 9am-6pm 1 Hour No Return Within 1 Hour	Pay & Display (Tariff Dartmouth A) 9am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours £1.50 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	Spithead The Quay
Limited Waiting 9am-6pm 2 Hours No Return Within 2 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Dartmouth A) 9am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours £1.50 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	Mayors Avenue
Limited Waiting 9am-6pm between 01 May and 30 Sep 2 Hours No Return Within 2 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Dartmouth A) 9am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours £1.50 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	College Way Mayors Avenue North Embankment
Honiton		
Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 9am-6pm 1 Hour No Return Within 2 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Honiton A) Mon-Sat 9am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours £1.50 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	High Street
Okehampton		
Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 9am-6pm 1 Hour No Return Within 2 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Okehampton A) Mon-Sat 10am-5pm 1 hour free 2 hours £1.00 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	Kempley Road Park Row
Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 10am-5pm 1 Hour No Return Within 2 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Okehampton A) Mon-Sat 10am-5pm 1 hour free 2 hours £1.00 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	Fairplace Terrace George Street Kempley Road Mill Road Park Row St James Street

Existing Restrictions	Proposed Restrictions	Roads Affected
Salcombe		
Limited Waiting 8am-6pm 2 Hours No Return Within 2 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Salcombe A) 8am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours £2.00 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	Cliff Road
Limited Waiting 8am-6pm 1 Hour No Return Within 1 Hour	Pay & Display (Tariff Salcombe A) 8am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours £2.00 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	Buckley Street Fore Street Island Street Market Street Shadycombe Road
Limited Waiting 8am-6pm 1 Hour No Return Within 1 Hour	Pay & Display (Tariff Salcombe B) 8am-6pm 30 mins free 1 hour £1.00 (Max Stay 1 Hour)	Fore Street
Limited Waiting 8am-6pm between 01 May and 30 Sep 2 Hours No Return Within 2 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Salcombe C) 8am-6pm between 01 May and 30 Sep 1 hour free 2 hours £2.00 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	Devon Road
Limited Waiting 8am-6pm 2 Hours No Return Within 2 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Salcombe D) 6am-10pm 1 hour free 2 hours £2.00 (Max Stay 2 Hours) No Motor Caravans	Cliff Road
Sidmouth	No Waiting 10pm-6am	
Limited Waiting 8am-8pm 30 Minutes No Return Within 1 Hour Exemption for Zone A Permit Holders	Pay & Display (Tariff Sidmouth B) 8am-8pm 30 mins free 1 hour £1.00 (Max Stay 1 Hour) Exemption for Zone A Permit Holders	Fortfield Terrace
Unrestricted Parking	Pay & Display (Tariff Sidmouth C) 10am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours £1.50 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	The Esplanade
Tavistock		
Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 9am-6pm 1 Hour No Return Within 2 Hours	Pay & Display (Tariff Tavistock A) Mon-Sat 9am-6pm 1 hour free 2 hours £1.30 (Max Stay 2 Hours)	Brook Street Duke Street Plymouth Road Russell Street West Street

Appendix 3 to CET/24/17 – Data provided to Town Councils 29th November 2023

It is the County's position that adopting a policy to utilise P&D in key communities will assist in managing parking stock effectively, minimising congestion and assisting in ensuring the right parking opportunities are available to support town centres. Cabinet resolved to proactively review parking management in our communities with 8 identified for the first tranche.

Efficiency

As has previously been explained Limited (LW) is the most labour intensive restriction to enforce, a Civil Parking Enforcement Officer (CEO) will need to visit the street and log all vehicle registrations, they will then need to plan their beat to return to that location to repeat the process after the end of the limited waiting period (but before the "no return" period expires). This is extremely laborious, and the presence of the CEO becomes well known meaning that abuse restriction is more likely and that spaces do not turn over as frequently as would be desired.

With P&D there is only one visit required and only data relating to vehicles parked in contravention needs to be gathered. There is a time saving and improved compliance meaning spaces will turn over more readily.

The team have looked at 2 comparable locations with each restriction; Exmouth Esplanade where P&D is applied and Dartmouth Embankment where LW is applied. Both with similar footprints (468m and 607m respectively) and capacity for parking (120 spaces and 116 spaces respectively). Over the 2 days of study Exmouth demanded an average of 44 minutes of officer time to be managed, no PCNs were issued. Dartmouth demanded an average of 107 minutes of officer time, 4 PCNs in total were issued. When taking into account length and capacity it is clear that LW can demand over 100% more time to manage compared to equivalent areas of Pay and Display (please see figure 1 Comparison of Enforcement Time).

In practical terms the time saving in Exmouth allows officers to attend to residents parking and other communities on that mobile beat, in this case Seaton. Within Dartmouth officers remain fully committed to the Town Centre and are not able to attend parking in adjacent areas such as Kingswear or Townstal which are served via other beats.

Contraventions

The team has reviewed data relating to the level of contravention across all 8 communities over the past 12 months, you will see that overstays in LW are overrepresented making up 45% of all PCNs issued in the past 12 months (3140 out of a total of 6970). Given the labour intensive mechanism of enforcing LW (explained above) it would suggest that there are many contraventions which are not detected each day. (See figure 2. PCN issue by community by contravention)

It is fair to point out the outlier, Braunton, where there is a much lower contravention rate (14.6%) within LW. There could be a number of reasons for this including a good level of compliance amongst visitors. Although it is worth noting that there is a relatively small amount of LW and with limited other duties officers will move between communities to make

best use of their time, i.e. moving between Braunton and Georgham and Croyde, this can mean that opportunities to provide a good attendance to limited waiting can be missed. This has been more pronounced in the past 12 months due to vacancies within the team meaning a need to combine more communities to provide coverage to the North Devon area. This is now addressed with a number of new appointments. The use of P&D will enhance service to Braunton.

Figure 1 Comparison of Enforcement Time

Community Location/s Exmouth

Dartmouth

Esplanade

North Embankment/South

Embankment/Rue de Courseulles

Sur Mer

Approx Length of P&D/Limited Waiting restrictions

468m (Mixed parallel and

echelon)

607m (All parallel to kerb)

Approx Potential Parking

Stock

120 Vehicles

116 Vehicles

Date	Location	Time spent in Location on Date	Observations	PCNs issued re LW / P&D	Time invested by Linear Metre	Time invested by Parking Stock
13/08/2023	Exmouth	00:48:07	4	0	00:00:06	00:00:24
13/08/2023	Dartmouth	01:30:43	66	1	00:00:09	00:00:47
17/08/2023	Exmouth	00:40:00	6	0	00:00:05	00:00:20
17/08/2023	Dartmouth	02:04:35	121	3	00:00:12	00:01:04

Additional time required

for LW: 144.3% 88.4% 152.8% Figure 2 PCN issue by community by contravention

Community	Total PCNs	01 Parked in a restricted street	02 Loading in restricted street	05 Parked after payment expired	11 Parked without payment	12 Parked in a residents' place	16 Parked in a permit space	19 Parked in a residents' place	21 Parked in a suspended bay	22 Re-parked in the same place	23 Wrong class of vehicle	24 Not parked correctly	25 Parked in a loading place	26 Double parking	27 Dropped footway	28 Parked adjacent to a raised footway or crossing	30 Parked longer than permitted	%	40 Disabled person's parking	42 Police vehicles	45 Taxi rank	46 Clearway	47 Restricted bus stop or stand	73 Parked without payment	82 Parked after payment expired	83 Parked without clear display	99 Pedestrian crossing
Braunton	171	124	3							1			8				25	14.62%	5		2	3					
Crediton	806	269	26							5	2		53		8		392	48.64%	35	4	6		4				5
Dartmouth	1839	521	217			16	29		22	5	6	4	26	3	1		954	51.88%	9	7			7				2
Honiton	667	230	32							4		4	41	1	9		254	38.08%	14		8		47				23
Okehampton	590	150	30							4		2	46	2	27		326	55.25%	17				11				1
Salcombe	945	212	31		2	77	16	13						1			515	54.50%	7		4		3	30	1	33	
Sidmouth	779	240	89	6	13		21		58	2	22	3	74	6	6		212	27.21%	13		13		1				
Tavistock	1172	210	161							40	40		450			4	400	20.200/	46		2		2				3
Tavistock	1173	319	161							12	10	1	152		1	1	462	39.39%	46		2		3				3

6970 3140 45.05%

Appendix 4 to CET/24/17 – Summary of Comments Received

Comment	Count
Braunton	•
Opposes the proposals	158
Supports the proposals	5
Respondent feels that pay and display restrictions will have a negative	79
impact on businesses in the town centre	
Respondent would like the parking to remain as it is now	35
Respondent feels there will be increased parking in residential areas	18
where spaces are already limited	
This is just a money making scheme	18
Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents	15
with mobility issues	
Respondent comments that elderly and disabled residents use the on-	11
street parking to access local businesses, many cannot walk far and may	
find it difficult getting a ticket	
Respondent feels that the pay and display will discourage people from	11
visiting the town	
Proposals will deter people from coming into town, they will use	10
supermarkets instead	
Respondent comments that a taxi rank is not needed in the village, taxis	9
are private hire and do not use the existing space	
Respondent does not agree with statement of reasons	9
Respondent feels that there are already pay and display car parks nearby	9
which can be used for longer visits.	
Short free parking allows locals & visitors a chance to pop into the town &	9
shop local	
Respondent why Taxi ranks are being extended when few taxis are	7
available in the area.	
The proposals will not improve congestion	7
Parking meters are detrimental to the look of the town	6
Respondent comments that the proposals are not wanted/ not required	6
The respondent feels the proposals will force people to park	6
inappropriately elsewhere	
Doubling the parking period will reduce the turnover of vehicles and	5
availability of parking	
Respondent comments that the changes will discourage people who just	5
want to pop into the shops quickly	_
Respondent says there is no evidence presented to support the proposal's	5
objectives	_
Respondent will visit the town less if pay and display is implemented	5
It is a waste of public money	4
The proposals will increase congestion	4
The proposals will not improve air quality	4
Charges will be detrimental to the community	3
Elderly people will just not come into the town if these changes are	3
implemented	

Comment	Count
Respondent comments that the changes will be detrimental to local	3
businesses as people rely on being able to park along the road for a short	
period of time, especially the elderly	
Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people	3
will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads	
Respondent comments that there has never been an issue with people	3
parking for too long	
Respondent comments that this scheme will not benefit the local	3
community	-
Respondent feels people will choose to shop out of town where parking is	3
free	· ·
Respondent feels that it isn't fair to charge people extra on top of the high	3
cost of living in the area	Ü
Respondent feels the proposals will not make any difference to pollution or	3
pedestrian safety	O
Vehicles in Braunton currently receive less penalty charge notices than in	3
the other communities where pay and display is proposed & no complaints	3
have been received by DCC about overparking on the A361 in the last five	
years (information received from an FOI request) so DCC have no reason	
to introduce pay and display in Braunton	
Access to town shops will be limited and costly to elderly population	2
	2
Council has not provided any justifiable reason for these unnecessary	2
proposals.	2
Free parking encourages locals and visitors into the town	2
It will mainly disadvantage families with small children and the elderly.	2
Once the restrictions are in place, DCC might increase the charges	2
Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more	2
difficult to access shops in the area	
Respondent comments that the machines should be located close to the	2
disabled bays as this will reduce the walking distance	
Respondent comments that the money collected is unlikely to offset the	2
cost of installation and maintenance	
Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current	2
situation and will only make things worse	
Respondent comments that there are rarely parking infringements along	2
the road, this is evidenced by the small amount of penalty charge notices	
issued over a short period between seven months and a year.	
Respondent comments that there is already limited waiting along this	2
stretch of road	
Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no	2
sense. It's not what the residents of the area want.	
Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set	2
ир	
Respondent feels that a very long stretch of parking with a single pay and	2
display machine that won't accept cards is unacceptable	

Comment	Count
Respondent feels that the proposals will affect access for the elderly and	2
disabled, as it will take them longer to carry out their business than the	
suggested free parking times	
Respondent feels your raising money at the cost of local communities	2
Respondent is a business owner and feels that the proposals will	2
negatively affect their business as well as other businesses	
Respondent requests better signage to off-street car parks	2
Respondent requests evidence to support the proposals	2
Respondent requests more enforcement	2
Respondent says there will be a negative environmental impact with all	2
those unnecessary paper tickets the machine will produce	
Respondent suggests installing a red-light camera on the crossroads as	2
there are several infringements there every single school run and	_
throughout the day. This would generate revenue and improve safety	
Respondent suggests that the taxi bay is replaced with a loading bay	2
The proposals will kill off the town and trade	2
These proposals will increase turnover	2
Will the free first hour parking sooner or later be replaced with a charge?	2
At times the main car parks are full, even in winter. In the summer tourists	1
park here and car parks are often full	'
Better signage to 'long stay' car parks would help visitors who are likely to	1
stay more than 2 hours.	ı
Charges made in Devon and Cornwall are exorbitant compared to	1
Northern England where charges are much more realistic and reasonable.	ı
These charges are likely designed to rip off tourists as often charges	
increase in the summer months.	
Charges would put additional financial strain on the citizens	1
<u> </u>	1 1
Concern is payment charges. Would hope there can be a minimum charge approx. 50p for 30 mins to allow people to "pop in" to an	ı
establishment quickly and easily. Equally if maximum payment charges	
are £1 hour or £5/day, I think more people would pay.	1
DCC should listen to the Parish Councillors as they understand the	ı
Community Devon County Council has not provided a plan of costs which shows how	1
' '	ı
surplus funds (after improved enforcement) will be used to offset the local service costs or how much the scheme will cost and how it is funded	
	1
Does not indicate if they support or oppose	1
Doing away with free parking may encourage people to drive further thus	1
increasing the carbon footprint	4
I understand that the Parish Council do not support the scheme and have	1
been trying to get it stopped	
if the town/village has a pay and display car park, any on street parking	1
should also be pay and display.	
Instead of paying out for parking meters, use the money to fix all the	1
potholes around town	
Money generated isn't enough to warrant such action	1
Money wasted on installing the meters and maintaining them	1

Comment	Count
Parking machines are composed of non-recyclable materials, lithium ion	1
batteries, plastics and other nasties. These are exactly what residents are	•
working to eradicate vis a vis sustainability.	
Parking meters will mean people will park for longer	1
Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours	1
Respondent asked if the cost of installing meters and monitoring be	<u>·</u> 1
justified by any revenue received	•
Respondent comments that efforts should be made at improving the traffic	1
flow at the main junction, this causes pollution and congestion due to the	•
poor layout of the junction and positioning of traffic lights	
Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area	1
because of their mobility	-
Respondent comments that if the council want to increase revenue they	1
should look at installing additional parking bays along The Esplanade,	
Woolacombe for motor homes	
Respondent comments that local residents are unlikely to pay for parking	1
in their own town	
Respondent comments that money could be spent elsewhere to improve	1
the area	
Respondent comments that parking is already difficult for disabled people	1
and these changes will make matters worse for the disabled community	
Respondent comments that public transport in the area is inadequate and	1
expensive	
Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter	1
disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental	
to their mental health	
Respondent comments that the changes will be detrimental to the majority	1
of the elderly population of the community	
Respondent comments that the changes will lead to higher prices, reduced	1
choice of goods and services and loss of local identity	
Respondent comments that the cost outlay is not justified	1
Respondent comments that the council should be promoting less	1
restrictions on parking, not more	
Respondent comments that the current disabled bays in Caen Street car	1
park are too far away to access the shops located on Exeter Road	
Respondent comments that the current situation brings people into the	1
town which keeps the shops going in the current economic climate	
Respondent comments that the inconvenience of having to get a ticket will	1
deter people from shopping in the area	
Respondent comments that the main problem of poor air quality is on	1
Caen Street. The only measures which have been implemented to try and	
improve this, is the removal of the lollipop person during the school run.	4
Respondent comments that the meters will cause major problems as	1
people won't have cash at hand in an area designated as free parking	
Respondent comments that the proposal to allow one hour free for people	1
to complete local shopping, with an addition fee for the second hour seem	
sensible	

Comment	Count
Respondent comments that the road needs more disabled bays not less and definitely not further down the road.	1
Respondent comments that the road needs more disabled bays. The main car park has several spaces, however it is a long way to walk from there to the main shops and post office	1
Respondent comments that the scheme is not relevant, as the stated benefits will not work at this location	1
Respondent comments that the suggested benefits will only occur if the number of people using the parking bays is significantly reduced, this will have an adverse affect on the local economy	1
Respondent comments that these changes are being introduced to resolve a problem that does not exist	1
Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops.	1
Respondent comments that visitors and locals should be able to access free parking within the centre to make it accessible to all	1
Respondent does not feel that these proposals will increase car turnover	1
Respondent feels it will cause too much disruption to residents while the scheme is being implemented	1
respondent feels meters will decrease revenue as this will drive people away	1
Respondent feels that drivers should not be responsible for subsidising buses	1
Respondent feels that it should be one of the council's highest priorities to maintain a vibrant and diverse community to include independent trade.	1
Respondent feels that parking should be improved in Wrafton Road which should include measures to slow down the traffic	1
Respondent feels that the council should look into a new relief road to take traffic away from the centre of Braunton, this will improve air quality for school children especially during the summer season.	1
Respondent feels the proposed parking charges are too high	1
Respondent feels there will be payment problems for elderly people who don't use payment apps or smart phones	1
respondent feels this will impact the poor far greater than the wealthy	1
Respondent objects to the shortening of the disabled bay on Exeter Road, Braunton	1
Respondent questions how far apart the meters will be, as the road is pretty long and will be difficult for elderly and disabled people to access.	1
Respondent questions what is the aim of charging? How much officer time will be spent on this project?	1
Respondent questions whether they need to decide how long they intend to stay when they first arrive or if they can purchase a 2 hour ticket after 1 hour free parking?	1
Respondent requests better signage for the Caen Street car park	1
Respondent says there is no financial benefit for the town commerce or residences	1

Comment	Count
Respondent suggests better communication and engagement with town	1
councils	
Respondent suggests creating more disabled bays	1
Respondent suggests extending the existing disabled bay into a double	1
Respondent suggests that the taxi rank be replaced with a loading bay or	1
more disabled parking	
Respondent wonders how the proposals will create a safer environment	1
Respondents asks to see plans of proposed restrictions in Caen Street,	1
Braunton as they are on the draft traffic order but no plan is available	
The existing businesses in the town centre do not report a problem with	1
the restrictions as they are	
The free parking enables many people, especially the elderly who may	1
otherwise avoid visiting the town, access the shops without them having to	
walk too far.	
The high levels of pollution will continue as people will still drive around	1
looking for a parking space	
The introduction of pay and display will constrain the Braunton Masterplan	1
from being able to go ahead. The masterplan includes plans to introduce	
build outs, wider footpaths and cycle provision on Exeter Road.	
The proposals show a loss of disabled bays and that the space will be	1
limited to 6.6 metres which assumes that vehicles used by blue badge	
holders are very small	
the proposals will increase turnover, therefore cars manoeuvring into	1
spaces will block the flow of traffic, creating more congestion on the main	
road	
The proposals will penalise locals who already struggle with the cost of	1
living	
The respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact parking for	1
locals	
There is an adequate off-street car parks in the town centre already. Why	1
are these not being utilised?	
There is no evidence to suggest that paid parking maintains free	1
movement of traffic better than the existing limited waiting	
There will be extra expense of installing and running of the scheme	1
These proposals are a waste of money	1
Will affect those with compromised mobility but not eligible for a Blue	1
Badge.	
Will not solve congestion or pollution.	1
Would the Council also consider overnight (6pm-8am) Motorhome parking	1
allocations for £8-£10, as respondent thinks this would bring extra funds	
into the location.	

Comment	Count
Crediton	
Opposes the proposals	158
Supports the proposals	6
Respondent feels that pay and display restrictions will have a negative	115
impact on businesses in the town centre	
Respondent would like the parking to remain as it is now	44
This is just a money making scheme	40
Proposals will deter people from coming into town, they will use	29
supermarkets instead	
Respondent feels that the pay and display will discourage people from	27
visiting the town	
Doubling the parking period will reduce the turnover of vehicles and	22
availability of parking	
Respondent feels that there are already pay and display car parks nearby	14
which can be used for longer visits.	
Once the restrictions are in place, DCC might increase the charges	10
The proposals will not improve air quality	9
The respondent feels the proposals will force people to park	9
inappropriately elsewhere	-
This scheme will not achieve goals set out in the Statement of Reasons.	9
Respondent feels there will be increased parking in residential areas	8
where spaces are already limited	
More vehicles driving around searching for spaces will increase emissions.	7
Respondent will visit the town less if pay and display is implemented	7
The proposals will not improve congestion	7
Money should be spent on fixing the roads	5
Money wasted on installing the meters and maintaining them	5
Respondent feels that getting a free 1 hour ticket from the machine will cut	5
into free time	Ü
Respondent feels there will be payment problems for elderly people who	5
don't use payment apps or smart phones	· ·
The proposals will increase congestion	5
The respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact parking for	5
locals	Ü
Meters will block pavements and make it harder for the pedestrians,	4
disabled and people with mobility issues	7
Parking meters are detrimental to the look of the town	4
Respondent comments that this scheme will not benefit the local	4
community	7
Respondent feels that it isn't fair to charge people extra on top of the high	4
cost of living in the area	7
Respondent says there is no evidence presented to support the proposal's	4
objectives	
Cashless parking creates an impossible barrier for those without	3
smartphones.	
If the goal is to reduce congestion, make a proper bus stop to avoid	3
queuing traffic and extra pollution on the main road.	

Comment	Count
Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents	3
with mobility issues	
Respondent does not agree with statement of reasons	3
Respondent does not feel properly consulted.	3
Respondent does not feel there is a congestion problem	3
Respondent feels DCC's proposals lack clarity	3
Respondent feels people will choose to shop out of town where parking is	3
free	
Respondent requests evidence to support the proposals	3
1 hour Free parking and the option to pay for 2 hours parking will allow for	2
more flexible shopping and a turnover of cars	
Due to Crediton's location, it relies on through trade being able to park	2
easily.	
Parking will be made worse not better	2
Respondent comments that the money collected is unlikely to offset the	2
cost of installation and maintenance	
Respondent does not agree with the revocation of 45 minute limited	2
waiting on Union Road.	
Respondent does not feel that these proposals will increase car turnover	2
Respondent feels that Pay & Display will push people away from the town	2
centre, particularly elderly and vulnerable people.	
Respondent feels the same proposals are being applied across different	2
towns without consideration for their individual circumstances	
Respondent feels there are not enough parking facilities available for	2
workers that work in town	
Respondent is a business owner and feels that the proposals will	2
negatively affect their business as well as other businesses	
Respondent questions how far apart the meters will be, as the road is	2
pretty long and will be difficult for elderly and disabled people to access.	
Respondent requests enforcement in Park Street, Crediton	2
Respondent suggests limiting the free parking in some areas to 30 minutes	2
Respondent supports proposal to extend free parking to 1 hour	2
Respondent supports the proposals, given that free parking remains	2
indefinitely and charges aren't raised	
there has been no evidence provided that the current restrictions don't	2
work.	
What will be the cost of installation and running meters?	2
Congestion is caused from buses waiting and double parked lorries	1
loading, not from on-street parking.	
Elderly people may get confused when using the machines	1
Elderly people visiting Crediton town centre park on-street to do their	1
shopping, as some of them cannot walk up the steep hill to St Saviours car	
park.	4
Enforcement will be costly	1
Existing public transport is poor, people have to use their cars	1
If machines are installed they need to accept credit cards and cash and	1
not to be solely accessible via a mobile phone app.	

Comment	Count
If public transport services were improved, this scheme would be viable.	1
If someone parks in Market Street disabled bays, the first hour is free but a	1
ticket must be paid for and displayed. If they don't need to be there for	
more than 1 hour, they are out of pocket.	
Low income families are really going to struggle with the new proposed	1
changes to parking.	
Motorists already make a disproportionate contribution to UK taxation,	1
some of the money gained from special car tax, fuel taxes and VAT on	
motoring goods should be used to provide proper parking facilities which	
encourage citizens to use our dying High Streets. Parking machines are composed of non-recyclable materials, lithium ion	1
batteries, plastics and other nasties. These are exactly what residents are	1
working to eradicate vis a vis sustainability.	
Pay & Display metres will only add to the street furniture, respondent	1
would like to see a form of survey on what can be done to reduce street	•
furniture e.g. discouraging businesses from putting out boards.	
Respondent agrees 2 hour restrictions in some areas would help	1
encourage visitors and may reduce congestion	
Respondent believes it should be no return within 1 hour, instead of 2.	1
Respondent comments that the changes will discourage people who just	1
want to pop into the shops quickly	
Respondent comments that the proposals are not wanted/ not required	1
Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to shops and	1
public buildings	
Respondent comments that the scheme is not relevant, as the stated	1
benefits will not work at this location	
Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set	1
Up	4
Respondent feels 1 hour of free parking is not enough	1
Respondent feels parking charges are already too high.	1
Respondent feels that pay and display will have a positive impact on businesses in the town centre	1
Respondent feels that the meters will be vandalised	1
Respondent feels that the way this has been advertised makes it confusing	<u>'</u> 1
and unclear how to respond	'
Respondent feels the proposal is unreasonable for people with mobility	1
issues that do not have a disabled badge	•
Respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact people that work	1
and park in town	
Respondent feels the proposals will reduce short parking ability by	1
extending to two hours rather than one present	
Respondent feels the proposed parking charges are too high	1
Respondent feels there are no issues with air quality	1
Respondent feels this appears to be a further residents and visitors tax	1
Respondent lived in Wales where parking is free, even in some multi-	1
storeys and town centres thrive, DCC should learn from this.	

Comment	Count
Respondent lives in a flat without parking and relies on the free parking to	1
be able to drop off their toddler etc.	
Respondent lives on "Market Street extension spur" and says visitors and	1
volunteers for Council events often use this lane as access when they	•
should not. Respondent is concerned proposed parking charges will lead	
to people parking on their private land.	
Respondent questions where will the residents park?	1
Respondent questions whether they need to decide how long they intend	1
to stay when they first arrive or if they can purchase a 2 hour ticket after 1	•
hour free parking?	
Respondent questions why East Street is being proposed for Pay &	1
Display when there are no shops, only residents. Where are residents of	•
East Street supposed to park?	
Respondent questions why Pay & Display tariffs are different in different	1
areas, for example Okehampton is £1 and Crediton is £1.50	•
Respondent reports that there is not enough available on-street parking in	1
the town centre	•
Respondent says not everyone can pay by phone or have the correct	1
change	•
Respondent says the proposals discriminates against and affects the least	1
well-off and vulnerable people	•
Respondent says the road from Market Square to High Street is too steep,	1
and therefore often move their car further up the road, with ticketing this is	•
no longer feasible	
Respondent suggests extending the current free 45 minute parking in	1
Crediton to 1 hour and removing the option to pay to extend this, to	•
maintain vehicle turnover.	
Respondent suggests improving the car parks	1
Respondent suggests introducing residents parking permits	1
Respondent suggests proposals should be advertised to reach a wider	1
audience through local press, radio and tv	•
Respondent supports the proposal to lift the 45 minute restrictions on	1
Union Road.	•
Respondent supports the proposals to exclude bank holidays from charges	1
and the removal of restrictions on certain roads.	'
Respondent why Taxi ranks are being extended when few taxis are	1
available in the area.	•
Respondent will consider moving out of Crediton if they're made to pay to	1
park.	•
Respondent wonders how the proposals will create a safer environment	1
Ridiculous proposals that only benefits tourism which already makes daily	1
life more stressful.	•
Short free parking allows locals & visitors a chance to pop into the town &	1
shop local	1
Some elderly people cannot carry large amounts of shopping and will go	1
back and forth to their car, lack of free parking will mean they have to shop	'
elsewhere.	
Giornicio.	

Comment	Count
The app used to pay for parking charges extra, this can be costly for frequent visitors.	1
The hassle to download apps to pay will likely drive visitors away.	1
The intention to attract more motorised visitors goes against the promotion of sustainable transport alternatives such as walking and cycling, as more motorists makes this more dangerous.	1
The loading bay on St Lawrence Green should be turned into parking as the shop it was implemented for is now gone and is now hardly ever used.	1
The mobile app to pay for parking is confusing.	1
The proposals will encourage people to shop online	1
The reasons given are generalised and do not reflect the situation in Crediton	1
The respondent suggests the first 2 hours should be free	1
The solution to improve air quality and reduce emissions on the High Street is to create a bypass.	1
The use of paper tickets is environmentally unfriendly and increases littering.	1
There is no evidence supporting the claim that it will improve air quality.	1
There is, for the most part, a period of free parking long enough to pop into the shops. Those that want to be in town longer, should have to pay.	1
These proposals are a waste of money	1
This proposal is unfair for those who live above the shops.	1
This proposal will reduce the amount that off-street parking is used.	1
This scheme will affect the overall quality of life for those living in the area	1
This would penalise local people from parking in the town and pushing them to park in the off street car parks	1
Will a third party be taking a percentage of the monies extracted from taxpayers?	1
Will this scheme be cashless, via an app?	1

Comment	Count
Dartmouth	
Opposes the proposals	638
Supports the proposals	35
Respondent feels that pay and display restrictions will have a negative	280
impact on businesses in the town centre	
Respondent feels that the pay and display will discourage people from	190
visiting the town	
Respondent would like the parking to remain as it is now	140
This is just a money making scheme	134
The respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact parking for	69
locals	
Respondent will visit the town less if pay and display is implemented	46
The proposals will not improve congestion	45
Respondent does not agree with statement of reasons	44
The max stay should be increased	33
Respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact people that work	31
and park in town	
Respondent suggests extending the Park & Ride service	30
The proposals will not improve air quality	30
I do not want to pay for parking	29
Respondent suggests introducing residents parking permits	26
Respondent feels the proposals will not make any difference to pollution or	23
pedestrian safety	
Respondent feels there will be increased parking in residential areas	23
where spaces are already limited	
Respondent reports that there is not much available off-street parking in	23
the town centre	
Respondent questions where will the residents park?	22
The respondent requests a year round Park & Ride service for Dartmouth	18
The respondent feels the proposals will force people to park	17
inappropriately elsewhere	
Respondent suggests parking should be free for locals	15
Respondent requests all day parking for residents and workers of the town	14
Respondent works in town and feels they won't be able to use on street	14
parking to park for work anymore	
Respondent suggests more buses to and from the town	13
Respondent is a business owner and feels that the proposals will	11
negatively affect their business as well as other businesses	
Respondent feels 1 hour of free parking is not enough	10
Respondent feels there are not enough parking facilities available for	10
workers that work in town	
Respondent questions where the workers park will	10
Charges would put additional financial strain on the citizens	8
I do not support the proposed parking charges	8
Respondent does not feel there is a congestion problem	7
Parking meters are detrimental to the look of the town	6
Respondent feels the proposed parking charges are too high	6

Comment	Count
Respondent requests evidence to support the proposals	6
The respondent suggests cheaper Park & Ride service	6
The respondent suggests parking up to 4 hours	6
Access to town shops will be limited and costly to elderly population	5
It's about time the powers that be listen to the residents/town's people	5
what they want /need as it's them that matter not decisions made by	
outsiders.	
Respondent feels people will choose to shop out of town where parking is	5
free	
Respondent suggests implementing existing summer restrictions all year	5
round	
Respondent suggests free parking at Park & Ride for workers	4
Respondent suggests keeping the current winter restrictions, charge for	4
parking during the summer	
The proposals will increase congestion	4
The respondent suggests the first 2 hours should be free	4
Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours	3
Respondent feels that it isn't fair to charge people extra on top of the high	3
cost of living in the area	
Respondent feels the proposals will force the festivals and events out of	3
Dartmouth	-
Respondent suggests better communication and engagement with town	3
councils	-
Respondent suggests improving the car parks	3
Respondent suggests year round limited waiting parking	3
Will now have to pay to provide care to vulnerable patients who require	3
home visits	· ·
I cannot afford to pay for parking	2
Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter months	2
Meters will block pavements and make it harder for the pedestrians,	2
disabled and people with mobility issues	_
Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents	2
with mobility issues	_
Respondent feels DCC's proposals lack clarity	2
Respondent feels pay & display may stop people wanting to volunteer in	2
Dartmouth	_
Respondent feels there is not enough free parking as it is	2
Respondent requests more enforcement	2
Respondent says there is no evidence presented to support the proposal's	2
	۷
objectives Respondent suggests investing into electric charging points	2
	2
Respondent suggests using the full length of the College Way verges for	2
parking The may stay should remain at 2 hours	2
The max stay should remain at 2 hours	2
The proposal fails to meet the basic requirements of section 45 of the	2

Comment	Count
The respondent suggests the area around The Quay and Mayors Avenue	2
could be seasonal	
This scheme will not achieve goals set out in the Statement of Reasons.	2
Will impact residents who do not have off-street parking	2
Will not solve congestion or pollution.	2
[FOI] Respondent requests details of all parking restrictions, traffic-related	1
proposals in Dartmouth under the "Freedom of Information Act 2000"	
[Motorhomes] Respondent requests more parking options for Motor	1
Caravans along the Embankment	
3007 forms received from Dartmouth Against Metered Parking (DAMP)	1
with signatures, addresses and comments opposing the introduction of pay	
and display in Dartmouth	
A local issue that should be decided locally with any changes and revenue	1
staying in the local area.	
An analysis of the existing parking availability and the effects of the	1
changes needs to be carried out	
At times the main car parks are full, even in winter. In the summer tourists	1
park here and car parks are often full	
Doubling the parking period will reduce the turnover of vehicles and	1
availability of parking	
Existing public transport is poor, people have to use their cars	1
Has any consideration been given to tradesmen and their livelihood, if	1
these proposals are implemented?	
Locals will be using the parking spaces more than visitors to the town	1
More and more properties are owned by second home owners who often	1
buy off-street parking spaces	
More vehicles driving around searching for spaces will increase emissions.	1
No publication of cost v return (cost/benefit analysis). This should be	1
mandatory.	
Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the	1
parking requirements of the residents of affected roads.	
Once the restrictions are in place, DCC might increase the charges	1
Please put alternative parking options in place before you restrict what is	1
currently available.	
Proposals will deter people from coming into town, they will use	1
supermarkets instead	
Respondent agrees 2 hour restrictions in some areas would help	1
encourage visitors and may reduce congestion	
Respondent already struggles to find a space with a residents permit and	1
feels this will only get worse	
Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in?	1
Respondent comments that Residents should not have to pay to park in	1
their own town.	
Respondent comments that the proposals are not wanted/ not required	1
Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their	1
premises	

Comment	Count
Respondent comments that this scheme will not benefit the local community	1
respondent feels a park and ride would be more beneficial	1
Respondent feels only new parking restrictions should be on caravans parking along the embankment	1
Respondent feels that the way this has been advertised makes it confusing and unclear how to respond	1
Respondent feels the proposal is unreasonable for people with mobility issues that do not have a disabled badge	1
Respondent feels the proposals will increase the town's visitors	1
Respondent feels the same proposals are being applied across different towns without consideration for their individual circumstances	1
Respondent feels there will be payment problems for elderly people who don't use payment apps or smart phones	1
Respondent feels this appears to be a further residents and visitors tax	1
respondent feels this is a further tax on motorists	1
Respondent is a coastguard rescue officer who needs their vehicle to respond to emergency incidents, parking outside of town will mean slower response times.	1
Respondent questions whether they need to decide how long they intend to stay when they first arrive or if they can purchase a 2 hour ticket after 1 hour free parking?	1
Respondent reports a petition totalling 3059 signatures, organised by resident E.C. and supported by the Town Council was presented to DCC on Friday 22nd December.	1
Respondent reports that there is not enough available on-street parking in the town centre	1
Respondent requests reviewing parking restrictions and signs in Week Hill and Lower Castle Road as they often get gridlocked/very congested	1
Respondent says the proposals discriminates against and affects the least well-off and vulnerable people	1
Respondent says the proposals will negatively affect people that volunteer in town and rely on free parking	1
Respondent says there should be a parking exemption for people who work or volunteer in town	1
Respondent suggests 12 hour restricted parking for workers along the embankment	1
Respondent suggests 12 hours and no return out of season parking	1
Respondent suggests adding (6pm-8am) motorhome parking allocations in Dartmouth for $\pounds 8-\pounds 10$	1
Respondent suggests adding Hauley Road to the proposal and to charge for parking from 10am to 4pm	1
Respondent suggests allowing at least 3 hours of free parking for local residents	1
Respondent suggests creating a car free zone	1
Respondent suggests introducing electric buses to help improve pollution levels	1

Comment	Count
Respondent suggests limiting the free parking in some areas to 30 minutes	1
Respondent suggests making seafront parking free up to 3 hours for year round	1
Respondent suggests retaining the free parking during the winter around Coronation Park	1
Shops are already struggling	1
The high levels of pollution will continue as people will still drive around looking for a parking space	1
The proposals do not propose any initiatives to encourage workers to make more sustainable travel choices	1
The proposals don't create more spaces	1
The proposals will encourage people to shop online	1
The proposals will increase the risk of harm to pedestrians and cyclists.	1
The respondent questions the reasons why this proposal is being introduced	1
The respondent suggests to provide the locals with free parking permits and make visitors to pay in the Mayors Ave or Park and Ride facilities.	1
There are a lot of vacant shop units in town already	1
These proposals contradict the 'Strategic Plan 2021-2025' Best Place	1
These proposals will increase turnover	1
Use of the Park & Ride service should be encouraged, especially for tourists	1
What problem is trying to be solved by metering spaces that currently are not?	1
Will enforcement officers have to check whether those who have bought a 1 hour ticket have extended it to 2 hours?	1
Will there be resident parking permits available?	1
Would residents have the option to buy permits?	1

Comment	Count
Honiton	
Opposes the proposals	438
Supports the proposals	3
Respondent feels that pay and display restrictions will have a negative	238
impact on businesses in the town centre	
Respondent feels that the pay and display will discourage people from	66
visiting the town	
This is just a money making scheme	63
Respondent would like the parking to remain as it is now	40
Respondent will visit the town less if pay and display is implemented	39
Respondent does not agree with statement of reasons	25
The respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact parking for	22
locals	
The proposals will not improve congestion	18
Respondent feels there will be increased parking in residential areas	15
where spaces are already limited	
I do not want to pay for parking	13
Parking meters are detrimental to the look of the town	12
Respondent feels people will choose to shop out of town where parking is	12
free	
Respondent is a business owner and feels that the proposals will	8
negatively affect their business as well as other businesses	
Respondent feels 1 hour of free parking is not enough	7
Respondent requests more enforcement	7
Money wasted on installing the meters and maintaining them	6
Respondent reports 2 hour stay is not needed and will reduce the car	6
turnover	
Charges would put additional financial strain on the citizens	5
Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues	5
Respondent requests evidence to support the proposals	5
Respondent does not feel that these proposals will increase car turnover	4
Respondent does not feel there is a congestion problem	4
Respondent feels DCC's proposals lack clarity	4
Respondent feels that getting a free 1 hour ticket from the machine will cut	4
into free time	
The proposals will not improve air quality	4
The respondent questions the reasons why this proposal is being	4
introduced	
It will cost more to fit the machines in the High Street than you get in return	3
Meters will block pavements and make it harder for the pedestrians,	3
disabled and people with mobility issues	
Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons	3
The proposals will increase congestion	3
Free parking encourages locals and visitors into the town	2

Comment	Count
Honiton Town Council's survey conducted in partnership with the chamber	2
of commerce in mid 2023 showed that of 1200 respondents, only 3	_
supported the introduction of pay and display. The other 1197 respondent	
said that they would reduce their visit to Honiton if pay and display was	
implemented.	
I cannot afford to pay for parking	2
Money should be spent on fixing the roads	2
Money should be spent on other services	2
Proposals will deter people from coming into town, they will use	2
supermarkets instead	
Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new	2
proposals?	
Respondent comments that this scheme will not benefit the local	2
community	
Respondent feels the proposals will not make any difference to pollution or	2
pedestrian safety	
Respondent says there is no evidence presented to support the proposal's	2
objectives	
the same proposals were rejected 10 years ago	2
This scheme will not achieve goals set out in the Statement of Reasons.	2
We already pay council tax	2
Will the regular markets on a Tuesday, Thursday and Saturday be	2
impacted by these proposals?	
Access to town shops will be limited and costly to elderly population	1
It will encourage people who need more time in the town centre who are	1
not able to walk long distances to car parks	
Maintaining the meters will cost small revenue	1
No publication of cost v return (cost/benefit analysis). This should be	1
mandatory.	
Parking should be for a maximum of one hour	1
Parking will be made worse not better	1
Please put alternative parking options in place before you restrict what is	1
currently available.	•
Pleased to see plans to reduce/restrict car use in town	1
Residents asks why the restriction time of 9am to 6pm isn't being	1
reviewed. What exactly is the benefit when most shops are closed by 5pm.	•
Respondent cannot walk very far. Elderly Sunday church goers and	1
market hall users at weekends need parking. Also, all users of St Paul's in	•
the evening, mostly elderly.	
Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area	1
because of their mobility	
Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set	1
up	
Respondent feels parking charges are already too high.	1
Respondent feels that Pay & Display will push people away from the town	1
centre, particularly elderly and vulnerable people.	

Comment	Count
Respondent feels that pay and display will have a positive impact on	1
businesses in the town centre	
Respondent feels that the meters would create additional health and safety	1
risks alongside the open drain system alongside parts of the pavement	
Respondent feels the proposals will increase the town's visitors	1
Respondent opposes to pay for the parking where they live.	1
Respondent questions whether they need to decide how long they intend	1
to stay when they first arrive or if they can purchase a 2 hour ticket after 1	
hour free parking?	
Respondent reports that there is not much available off-street parking in	1
the town centre	
Respondent requests all day parking for residents and workers of the town	1
Respondent suggests 30min free parking for on street and off street car	1
parks	
Respondent suggests adding a 30 min pay option to 1 hour FREE parking	1
Respondent suggests designated parking areas or public transportation	1
Respondent suggests double yellow lines at the bottom end of town on	1
one side to allow traffic to flow	
Respondent suggests improving the car parks	1
Respondent suggests more buses to and from the town	1
Respondent suggests parking should be free for locals	1
Respondent suggests to consult with other councils outside of the area	1
Respondent suggests to move to the parking disc scheme as used in Cumbria	1
Respondent would like to know how long will take to recoup the cost of	1
installing meters? Will market traders have to pay?	
Respondent would like to know how the blue badge holders will be	1
affected by the proposals and will there be more or less disabled spaces.	
Respondent would like to know payment options available	1
Shops are already struggling	1
Supports idea of increasing revenue from on road parking	1
The existing businesses in the town centre do not report a problem with	1
the restrictions as they are	
The hassle to download apps to pay will likely drive visitors away.	1
The proposal will have people parking in Jerrard Crescent to avoid the	1
parking charge.	
The respondent suggests to provide the locals with free parking permits	1
and make visitors to pay in the Mayors Ave or Park and Ride facilities.	
Will the road markings be refreshed if these proposals are implemented?	1

Comment	Count
Okehampton	
Opposes the proposals	602
Supports the proposals	6
Respondent feels that pay and display restrictions will have a negative	241
impact on businesses in the town centre	
Respondent would like the parking to remain as it is now	150
Respondent feels that the pay and display will discourage people from	89
visiting the town	
This is just a money making scheme	85
The proposals will kill off the town and trade	63
Respondent feels there will be increased parking in residential areas	44
where spaces are already limited	
Respondent will visit the town less if pay and display is implemented	34
The proposals will increase congestion	29
The proposals will not improve congestion	23
Respondent requests evidence to support the proposals	22
Shops are already struggling	22
Respondent does not agree with statement of reasons	21
The respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact parking for	21
locals	
Meters will block pavements and make it harder for the pedestrians,	18
disabled and people with mobility issues	
Short free parking allows locals & visitors a chance to pop into the town &	18
shop local	
The proposals will encourage people to shop online	18
Respondent does not feel there is a congestion problem	17
respondent feels this is a further tax on motorists	17
Respondent feels that it isn't fair to charge people extra on top of the high cost of living in the area	16
Doubling the parking period will reduce the turnover of vehicles and	14
availability of parking	
Respondent feels that there are already pay and display car parks nearby	14
which can be used for longer visits.	
Respondent says the proposals would lead people to double park when	14
shoppers' short term parking spaces are blocked with 2 hour parkers	
The proposals will not improve air quality	14
Respondent feels people will choose to shop out of town where parking is	12
free	
Charges would put additional financial strain on the citizens	11
More vehicles driving around searching for spaces will increase emissions.	11
Respondent comments that the changes will discourage people who just	11
want to pop into the shops quickly	
These proposals are a waste of money	11
Once the restrictions are in place, DCC might increase the charges	10
Parking meters are detrimental to the look of the town	10
Respondent feels 3 supermarkets in one place is ridiculous. this are the areas with congestion	10

Comment	Count
Existing public transport is poor, people have to use their cars	9
Free parking encourages locals and visitors into the town	9
Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents	9
with mobility issues	
Respondent feels there will be payment problems for elderly people who	9
don't use payment apps or smart phones	
It is a waste of public money	8
It will de-value our homes	8
Proposals will deter people from coming into town, they will use	8
supermarkets instead	
Respondent questions where will the residents park?	8
Respondent is a business owner and feels that the proposals will	7
negatively affect their business as well as other businesses	
there has been no evidence provided that the current restrictions don't	7
work.	
We can drive 20 minutes down A30 to get free parking in Launceston.	7
Charges will be detrimental to the community	6
In some places the width of the pavement is not wide enough to	6
accommodate a meter & allow a wheel chair user to pass	
Maybe time would be better spent sorting the traffic issues around the 3 in	6
town supermarkets where there would be considerable air pollution at busy	
times.	
Parking charges will affect the short term shoppers	6
Respondent feels there is not enough free parking as it is	6
Respondent feels this appears to be a further residents and visitors tax	6
Respondent wonders how the proposals will create a safer environment	6
Station Road needs to be looked at due to congestion	6
Will not solve congestion or pollution.	6
Town requires more infrastructure for shoppers with supermarkets located	5
elsewhere to relieve central town traffic and parking issues.	
Cashless payment is not always easier	5
DCC talk to local residents	5
I do not support the proposed parking charges	5
It is difficult enough for businesses and events to attract people to the	5
town. Introducing parking charges is another factor for any potential	
visitors to choose to go elsewhere	
Meters are costly to install.	5
Proposals are a barrier to accessibility	5
Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set	5
up	
Respondent does not feel that these proposals will increase car turnover	5
Respondent says there is no evidence presented to support the proposal's	5
objectives	
Respondent suggests introducing residents parking permits	5
Respondent suggests more buses to and from the town	5
The congestion that exists has more to do with poorly synchronised traffic	5
lights than on street parking.	

Comment	Count
As a council you are not allowed to use the revenue from parking charges	4
for anything other than upholding of the parking restrictions.	•
Cashless parking creates an impossible barrier for those without	4
smartphones.	
Councils must not force people to use smartphones to pay for parking	4
Elderly people may get confused when using the machines	4
If machines are installed, they need to accept credit cards and cash and	4
not to be solely accessible via a mobile phone app.	
Instead of paying out for parking meters, use the money to fix all the	4
potholes around town	
Local access needs addressing	4
Money should be spent on other services	4
No consideration of disabled drivers.	4
Okehampton has extraordinary housing developments, approved by DCC	4
(with no investment in local services).	
Respondent comments that elderly and disabled residents use the on-	4
street parking to access local businesses, many cannot walk far and may	
find it difficult getting a ticket	
Respondent does not feel properly consulted.	4
Respondent feels there are no issues with air quality	4
The proposals will penalise locals who already struggle with the cost of	4
living	
The traffic in Okehampton has nothing to do with parking. It is the	4
allowance of large supermarkets to be placed down a cul-de-sac.	
There will be extra expense of installing and running of the scheme	4
Will impact residents who do not have off-street parking	4
It will mainly disadvantage families with small children and the elderly.	3
Money wasted on installing the meters and maintaining them	3
Not many people abuse the use of the free hour that is currently available	3
Okehampton Council have already held a public consultation on the	3
proposed parking scheme and the result was a resounding 97% against it.	
Parking will be made worse not better	3
Reduce cost of parking in car parks so people will use them	3
Respondent believes that the real reason for these meters is to raise	3
money for buses.	
Respondent comments that the inconvenience of having to get a ticket will	3
deter people from shopping in the area	
Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current	3
situation and will only make things worse	
Respondent comments that this scheme will not benefit the local	3
community	
Respondent feels its less carbon friendly due to needing power to pay and	3
display machines	
respondent feels meters will decrease revenue as this will drive people	3
away	
Respondent feels parking meters will cause inconvenience to loading and	3
unloading	

Comment	Count
Respondent feels that the proposals will affect access for the elderly and	3
disabled, as it will take them longer to carry out their business than the	
suggested free parking times	
Respondent feels this would create a fairer environment	3
Respondent feels you're going to go ahead regardless of objections	3
Respondent requests free parking permits for residents	3
Respondent would like to know payment options available	3
The Borough Council considers that the proposals fail to consider properly	3
the social, economic and environmental implications of introducing	
charges for on-street parking	
The requirement for parking meters will cause extra obstructions on	3
pavements often outside private houses.	
There is an adequate off-street car parks in the town centre already. Why	3
are these not being utilised?	
There is no evidence supporting the claim that it will improve air quality.	3
What evidence is there of lack of health and safety to pedestrians?	3
What will be the cost of installation and running meters?	3
Will affect those with compromised mobility but not eligible for a Blue	3
Badge.	
Will there be resident parking permits available?	3
You currently pay for Traffic Wardens so that wouldn't change.	3
A full time civil enforcement officer will be needed to police the meters or	2
expensive cameras installed.	
An analysis of the existing parking availability and the effects of the	2
changes needs to be carried out	
Any income gained from increased meter use will be offset by the need to	2
employ additional traffic wardens to monitor the parking situation.	
Appointments will become ever more stressful as the appointment time	2
does not coincide with the meter time.	
Area is one of the few where there is free parking in the town.	2
At this time there seems to be no detailed plans as to where the meters	2
will be located and what effect they may have on pavement width	
restrictions (1200mm is required)	
Charges would put additional financial strain on workers	2
Council has not provided any justifiable reason for these unnecessary	2
proposals.	
Current parking has made the respondent avoid the town	2
DCC should listen to Town Councils as they oppose the proposals	2
Even though the first hour is going to be free, people will not want the	2
hassle of going to a machine to get a ticket	
feels this will lead to social isolation	2
Greatly harm the town centre's trade putting people off visiting and do	2
nothing more than provide further revenue for DCC and clog up residential	
streets.	
I cannot afford to pay for parking	2
I do not want to pay for parking	2

Comment	Count
If any premises access has been blocked, signage warning of clamping or graphic symbols painted on the road would be more effective, such as a	2
yellow grid.	
If public transport services were improved, this scheme would be viable.	2
If some streets were made one way it would be simpler.	2
If you don't fit them, there is no costs, so no charge needed	2
Improved weight restriction signage would be more appropriate if big vehicles are causing blockages.	2
In Okehampton's case these streets are used in the majority by people within a ten mile radius, not tourists who are visiting the seaside or wild areas of Dartmoor.	2
It's about time the powers that be listen to the residents/town's people what they want /need as it's them that matter not decisions made by outsiders.	2
Linking Fore Street and Market Street pedestrian crossing with main traffic lights feels it would ease traffic flow	2
Locals will be using the parking spaces more than visitors to the town	2
Money should be spent on fixing the roads	2
No publication of cost v return (cost/benefit analysis). This should be mandatory.	2
Offers nothing for Okehampton except further damage by DCC to the town.	2
Okehampton is a very pleasant provincial town, this scheme is the beginning of the death knell	2
parking just needs to be easy and accessible	2
Parking meters will mean people will park for longer	2
Parking should not be limited or charged for on bank holidays.	2
Pensioners with limited mobility but who do not qualify for a disabled badge, still need to pop into the post office to pay bills & only need to park for 5 minutes.	2
Queues trying to get out of supermarket car parks onto Fore Street will be much longer. Quite normal now to spend 30 minutes trying to exit.	2
residents feel it's already difficult to park in station road due to people parking in that street for work/shopping/station	2
Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays?	2
Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads	2
Respondent comments that the money collected is unlikely to offset the cost of installation and maintenance	2
Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary	2
respondent feels a park and ride would be more beneficial	2
Respondent feels that drivers should not be responsible for subsidising buses	2
Respondent feels that social interaction will greatly reduce	2
Respondent feels that the meters will be vandalised	2
Respondent feels that they are having meters inflicted upon them	2

Comment	Count
Respondent feels the proposal is unreasonable for people with mobility	2
issues that do not have a disabled badge	_
Respondent feels the proposals will not make any difference to pollution or	2
pedestrian safety	_
Respondent feels the same proposals are being applied across different	2
towns without consideration for their individual circumstances	_
respondent feels this will impact the poor far greater than the wealthy	2
Respondent feels your raising money at the cost of local communities	2
Respondent reports 2 hour stay is not needed and will reduce the car	2
turnover	_
Respondent requests more enforcement	2
Respondent states the proposals will make it harder for people to shop	2
local	_
Respondent suggests adding more free parking to boost the local	2
economy.	_
Respondent suggests investing into electric charging points	2
Respondent suggests investing into electric charging points Respondent suggests parking should be free for locals	2
Respondent will not be able to afford to shop in town along with a lot of	2
people.	2
Ridiculous idea, spending money disrupting pavements for something not	2
needed or wanted	2
Some residents have stated they would prefer a rise in council tax than to	2
be penalised on parking	2
The max stay should be increased	2
The proposed charges will prevent people using the off-street car parks	2
The respondent feels the proposals will force people to park	2
inappropriately elsewhere	2
The respondent suggests the first 2 hours should be free	2
The strategy that DCC has taken in deciding to implement this policy	2
without thorough consultation is undemocratic means that DCC will easily	2
be able to go back on that promise once meters have been installed.	
The use of paper tickets is environmentally unfriendly and increases	2
littering.	2
This scheme will affect the overall quality of life for those living in the area	2
We are a rural town where everyone will go to town for a bit of shopping	2
and to see people. It is good for mental health	2
We should be encouraging new business and employment	2
West Devon Borough Council is requesting a face-to-face meeting with the	2
County Council, Borough Council, Okehampton and Tavistock Town	4
Councils and other key stakeholders	
When the scheme is set up, how long is it before the costs are met and	2
where is the money coming from?	4
Why should we not have some free parking areas within the town?	2
[Congestion] The proposed changes to parking in Okehampton are	1
purportedly in order to alleviate congestion in the town.	ı
For those of us living in villages there is no sympathetic bus service,	1
walking is impossible to access Okehampton and taxis cost too much	1
maining to impossible to access Orientampton and taxis cost too much	

Comment	Count
A local issue that should be decided locally with any changes and revenue	1
staying in the local area.	
A paid for 2 hr will surely cost more than the potential returns and inhibit	1
visits.	
A proper consultation would take the information out to the residents - not	1
hide it away and hope no one notices until it is too late	
A trip to the cinema frequently requires more time. Are you trying to	1
damage Carlton Cinema's business?	
Assumes this as a tax on enjoyment of those visiting and spending time	1
(and money) in a quality in the resort.	
Because I live on one of those streets	1
Better signage to 'long stay' car parks would help visitors who are likely to stay more than 2 hours.	1
Better spend money enforcing existing parking regulations, laws, and acts	1
of parliament.	
Bringing Okehampton into line with other comparable sized local towns is	1
not a justifiable reason to introduce parking charges.	
Can something be done about Blue Badge Holders parking wherever they	1
choose regularly?	
Commuters will be taking over all day parking and the residents will lose	1
the opportunity to park and shop at their leisure	
Conservation areas should not have street furniture	1
Could the Old Bostocks site in Okehampton to be turned into a car park?	1
Could the proposals be complemented by development of safer cycling	1
routes and pedestrian only areas in the shopping centre?	1
DCC consider the government to be imposing on their rights to charge for disposal of some kinds of waste at recycling centres – yet are doing just	ı
this to the towns affected by the implementation of pay and display parking	
proposals.	
Don't think proposals for 1 hour free and max of 2 hours is going to help. If	1
people don't know how long they need to stay they will pay for the extra	•
hour and then make sure they use it.	
Elected councillors are supposed to represent the electors, not allowing	1
wish lists of council employees.	
Enforcement will be costly	1
Everyone wants to keep our lovely independent shops	1
Footfall will affect our residential privacy	1
For the many 100's of people plus the elderly who have no online/email	1
facilities where do they send the form to?	
Funds could be better spent on other more worthwhile schemes such as	1
improving the hospital provision for the town.	
Has any consideration been given to tradesmen and their livelihood, if	1
these proposals are implemented?	
Have DCC produced any costings in relation to this proposed exercise? If	1
so, please can the information be made public? If not, why not?	
Having to pay for parking will make me less likely to want to go into town	1

Comment	Count
Holidaying second home owners create more emissions when running to	1
and from their rural escapes than locals do on a day to day basis	.
Hope there can be a minimum charge (approx. 50p) for half an hour.	1
Hopefully the proposals will ease congestion in town	1
How about resurfacing the main access road (Exeter Road) and putting in	1
traffic calming measures to slow the vehicles down that race down (and	
up) Exeter Road.	
How does designating paid parking spaces on the highway maintain free	1
movement of traffic and reasonable access to premises?	
How much is this costing?	1
I am a Pensioner having to pay would impact a lot on my finances.	1
If maximum payment charges are £1 hour or £5 per day, respondent thinks	1
more people would pay.	
if the town/village has a pay and display car park, any on street parking	1
should also be pay and display.	
If there was a bus available each day from Northlew then respondent	1
thinks this could be justified	
If you go ahead with your proposals, you will actually be in breach of	1
paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act	
1995 (air quality) and I believe that Okehampton Town Council would be	
entitled to take legal action against DCC for this breach.	
If you want to reduce congestion and emissions then start by improving	1
services.	
If you want to save money reduce either salary of top executives or reduce	1
number of them or both	
If you're saying it will improve air quality, you're saying fewer people will be	1
in the town.	
Implementation of pay and display parking will enable DCC future	1
opportunities to future expand the scheme to other areas.	4
Imposing quite unnecessary changes to people who live in residential	1
roads such as Kempley Road and Park Road	1
In order to help local businesses, town centres and encourage visitors,	ı
West Devon Borough Council have not raised their car parking charges since 2018	
Inconvenience and time wasted while paying for parking, and disruption	1
from defective ticket machines	
Introduction of parking permits in Park Road and Kempley Road	1
It is not clear how any money raised will benefit the town or its shoppers	1
and businesses.	·
It will cost more to fit the machines in the High Street than you get in return	1
Low income families are really going to struggle with the new proposed	<u>·</u> 1
changes to parking.	•
Many ways to achieve the outcomes proposed such as a better car park	1
on the edge of town enabling those wishing to shop for longer the	
opportunity to park and walk in	
Meters may sometimes not be working as at Okehampton Station resulting	1
in fines and inability to park.	

Comment	Count
Meters will damage the accessibility of the pavements that are already	1
narrow	
meters won't stop motorists overstaying	1
No economic impact assessment has been carried out by DCC who when	1
asked for evidence said the council needed to take the officers opinion that	
it will.	
No evidence has been provided as requested by the town/parish councils	1
with the exception of PCN figures.	
Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the	1
parking requirements of the residents of affected roads.	
Okehampton is currently a thriving diverse town	1
Parking should be for a maximum of one hour	1
Parking time is being extended to 2 hours reducing available car parking spaces available by half	1
paying for the second hour will stop people staying longer and visiting	1
more places in the town	•
Please schedule a public meeting in town to gauge opinion in the new year	1
(2024)	
Presumably Devon County are aware this is a conservation area?	1
Proposals should encourage people to get out of cars and walk & cycle	1
instead. Benefit health.	
Proposals will cause light pollution	1
Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours	1
Questions posed to Councillor Lois Samuels, have not been properly	1
addressed or answered, why is this?	
Refused to delay the consultation, as requested by a number of the	1
affected town/parish councils, until January so that it did not coincide with	
the Christmas and New Year period with no reasons or explanation having	
been given.	
Resident feels this will create noise pollution	1
Resident from Crediton Rd supports proposal as" motor tech" garage uses	1
the roads as a free car park and pay & display would prevent this	1
Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality Respondent agrees that enforcement will be easier if meters were installed	1
regardless of whether payment was required or not	1
Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons	1
Respondent asked if the cost of installing meters and monitoring be	1
justified by any revenue received	•
Respondent askes how do you believe monitoring pay and display only	1
requires one visit whilst limited parking requires constant monitoring	-
Respondent askes how much has it cost Devon County Council to just get	1
to this point	
Respondent asks have you ever successfully run your own business?	1
Respondent asks how about access to our shops especially in the arcade	1
where owners don't have parking available to them and rely on street	
parking to onload goods.	

Comment	Count
Respondent asks how long will it take to recoup the outlay on installing the	1
meters.	
Respondent asks how the spare machines that DCC have in storage are	1
paid for	
Respondent asks how this will be enforced when its currently not being	1
regularly monitored	4
Respondent asks if disabled bays will remain at 2 hours maximum stay	1
Respondent asks if there are any proposals relating to the cost of annual permits, included in this proposal due to the reduction of available parking	1
spaces	
Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in?	1
Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area	1
because of their mobility	•
Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more	1
difficult to access shops in the area	
Respondent comments that local residents are unlikely to pay for parking	1
in their own town	
Respondent comments that money could be spent elsewhere to improve	1
the area	
Respondent comments that parking is already difficult for disabled people	1
and these changes will make matters worse for the disabled community	
Respondent comments that the changes will be detrimental to local	1
businesses as people rely on being able to park along the road for a short	
period of time, especially the elderly Respondent comments that the changes will be detrimental to the majority	1
of the elderly population of the community	1
Respondent comments that the council should be promoting less	1
restrictions on parking, not more	•
Respondent comments that the current situation brings people into the	1
town which keeps the shops going in the current economic climate	
Respondent comments that the proposal to allow one hour free for people	1
to complete local shopping, with an addition fee for the second hour seem	
sensible	
Respondent comments that the proposals are not wanted/ not required	1
Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to shops and	1
public buildings	4
Respondent comments that these changes are being introduced to resolve	1
a problem that does not exist Respondent comments that visitors and locals should be able to access	1
free parking within the centre to make it accessible to all	•
Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	1
eventually being reduced to 30 min, then none at all.	-
Respondent feels as if being misled as notices were removed within a few	1
hours	
Respondent feels it will cause too much disruption to residents while the	1
scheme is being implemented	

Comment	Count
Respondent feels like this is income generation with little or no regard for	1
residents	
Respondent feels parking is currently too expensive	1
Respondent feels that pay and display will have a positive impact on	1
businesses in the town centre	
Respondent feels that the town is already dying	1
Respondent feels the proposals will undermine the objectives of the Local	1
Transport Plan	
Respondent feels there are not enough parking facilities available for	1
workers that work in town	
Respondent feels this appears to be an underhand way of generating	1
council funds	
Respondent feels you are forced into entering your personal details to	1
complete the consultation form	
Respondent is a business owner and feels that the proposals will positively	1
affect their business	
Respondent is unlikely to vote for councillors and candidates that supports	1
the new proposals	
Respondent owns properties where there are already issues with	1
unauthorised parking on private property. These proposals will make it	
worse.	
Respondent questions where will the workers park	1
Respondent raises objection to this consultation happening at the busiest	1
time of the year for customers and traders	•
Respondent refuses to pay for this as a tax payer	1
Respondent requests all day parking for residents and workers of the town	1
Respondent says money would be better spent on employment and	<u>.</u> 1
increased CEO presence	·
Respondent says not everyone can pay by phone or have the correct	1
change	•
Respondent says the proposals discriminates against and affects the least	1
well-off and vulnerable people	•
Respondent says there is no financial benefit for the town commerce or	1
residences	'
Respondent says there will be a negative environmental impact with all	1
those unnecessary paper tickets the machine will produce	'
Respondent states that DCC could raise money in another way	1
Respondent states that more enforcement would be required so cost to	<u>'</u> 1
residents would increase	'
	1
Respondent states that the car parks are always full so don't need to charge for on street parking as well	1
	1
Respondent suggests better communication and engagement with town councils	I
Respondent suggests charging 2nd home owners higher council tax rates	1
to increase revenue	
Respondent suggests improving the car parks	1
Respondent suggests limiting the free parking in some areas to 30 minutes	1

Comment	Count
	4
Respondent suggests rerouting lorries away from the town centre	1
Respondent suggests relocating the college to out of town and to stop building more houses on green fields	1
Respondent suggests to massively ease congestion at busy times around	1
the roundabouts open up an exit in the Waitrose car park onto Oaklands	1
Drive.	
Respondent supports proposal to extend free parking to 1 hour	1
Respondent supports the proposals as lots of houses have multiple	1
vehicles and some are dormant for weeks on end	'
Respondent understands the meters have already been purchased	1
Respondent understands the meters have already been purchased Respondent understands there is a need for revenue, but this is a false	1
economy as business rates will drop when the shops shut up for good.	'
Respondent would like to know how the blue badge holders will be	1
affected by the proposals and will there be more or less disabled spaces.	'
Respondent would only support this if it was from Monday to Friday and if	1
not would oppose	'
Revenue from parking should be kept local to keep costs for residents	1
down, not be put into funds to be used for the whole of Devon	'
short term point of view without looking at the future cost	1
Spend the money on things needed, pavements so people can walk to	1
school and garden centre.	'
stop wasting tax payers money	1
Stopping for a few minutes is common if I only need to drop a document to	1
the accountant or solicitor. I would double my parking time if I had to pay	•
Suggests residents parking permits for Okehampton. DCC would still get	1
money from permits.	•
Supports idea of increasing revenue from on road parking	1
Tax payers are paying for services which DCC are not providing across all	1
the road systems and streets in Okehampton, yet DCC, have voted to	
spend money on unwanted and unneeded projects	
Tax payers money best spent inspecting and repairing the streets and	1
roads	
The council could consider measures to improve areas for pedestrians and	1
enable a free flow of traffic	
The council don't do anything with the money we give them already our	1
town's roads are shocking	
The council is trying to encourage less use of cars, however this is when	1
local transport is inadequate	
The free parking enables many people, especially the elderly who may	1
otherwise avoid visiting the town, access the shops without them having to	
walk too far.	
The high levels of pollution will continue as people will still drive around	1
looking for a parking space	
The max stay should remain at 2 hours	1
The only congestion near the roads covered by the proposals is for the	1
short time when buses deliver and collect many of the pupils of	
Okehampton College.	

Comment	Count
The only congestion occurs when the children are going to school AM and	1
leaving school PM.	
The only cost would be installing meters.	1
The parking situation in the town is already confusing enough with all 3	1
supermarket car parks operating different parking rules.	
The police station resurfacing their car park was a complete waste of	1
public money	
The proposals will negatively impact tourism.	1
The proposed changes do not deal with the areas where there is	1
congestion like Station Road, rather they apply where local residents park	
to do their shopping.	
The psychology of paying to park over-rides any extra costs of shopping	1
and this must be explained to Devon Highways by Shop Owners	
The public should not be paying to fund council money making schemes	1
as this is what it is.	
The respondent feels the proposals will provide more chance to park for	1
locals, especially the elderly and families	
The respondent suggests that we need to monitor surrounding streets if	1
proposals go ahead as displaced parking may warrant expanding	
residents parking areas and areas where key workers can find parking at a	
fair price	
The same proposals were rejected 10 years ago	1
The suggestion of payment after an hour gives the perception of "paid	1
parking"	
There are a lot of vacant shop units in town already	1
There are three good long term parks.	1
There is a lack of parking currently	1
There may be payment issues due to poor mobile and/or internet signal in	1
the town centre	
These proposals will increase turnover	1
They are not competently contributing to our local businesses and	1
therefore job creation and deprive local people of affordable homes to live	•
in.	
This is not a cost-effective use of public funds	1
This will cause people to remain in parking bays all day, it is therefore	1
limiting parking	·
this will reduce short term parking	1
To help residents, tourist and businesses car parking charges should be	<u>·</u> 1
reduced or got rid of completely.	·
To truly reduce congestion and journey times you would need to build a	1
new bridge, so the town centre could be one-wayed.	•
Too many parking restrictions already that put locals and visitors off	1
shopping in or coming to town	ı
Traders/shops who are face to face and speak daily with shoppers oppose	1
the plan saying it will negatively affect their business. Why would Council	1
planners deliberately make a decision that is highly likely to cause a down	
turn in trade? Surely this is counterproductive.	

Comment	Count
We already pay council tax	1
We are a town that needs all the business we can get. Making car parks as expensive as Exeter car parks will just make more and more travel that way to shop. We don't have all of our shops with a business and sitting empty.	1
What the town requires is a new car park instead	1
What's next? A type of ULEZ?	1
When budgets are tight, the cost of installing a parking system with no benefit is totally unnecessary.	1
Why has planning been allowed for the new railway station to be opened at the top of a hill away from where most of the residents are?	1
Why was this proposed scheme not advertised in the local area being literature available on lamp posts or posted to affected roads?	1
Will now have to pay to provide care to vulnerable patients who require home visits	1
With the construction of new housing developments, Devon County Council have failed to provide necessary infrastructure which creates congestion	1
Would it not be more useful for a one way link from School Way to North Street, which I think was proposed when Lidl were granted planning permission!	1
Would residents have the option to buy permits?	1
Would the Council also consider overnight (6pm-8am) Motorhome parking allocations for £8-£10, as respondent thinks this would bring extra funds into the location.	1
You will be contributing to Rural Poverty	1
You will ignore the result from the public consultation anyway	1

Comment	Count
Salcombe	
Opposes the proposals	29
Supports the proposals	1
This is just a money making scheme	5
Respondent would like the parking to remain as it is now	4
Respondent feels that pay and display restrictions will have a negative	3
impact on businesses in the town centre	
Respondent feels that the pay and display will discourage people from visiting the town	3
Doubling the parking period will reduce the turnover of vehicles and availability of parking	2
(Residents Parking Egremont Terrace] Request for residents parking as	1
one of few areas of the lower area of town which has no residents parking	
and not allowed to apply for other designated areas in the town.	
People with camper vans should be able to park at North Sands like	1
anyone else, but not camp overnight	
At risk of deterring all those who rely on private transport and simply	1
cannot use private transport - would take 5 hours to travel to mother by	
bus, 1 hour by car.	
Businesses such as the Yacht Club, Pilates, Yoga classes and charities	1
such as the RNLI all rely on access by car without excessive charging	
Cars have become even larger further reducing capacity.	1
Charges made in Devon and Cornwall are exorbitant compared to	1
Northern England where charges are much more realistic and reasonable.	
These charges are likely designed to rip off tourists as often charges	
increase in the summer months.	
Charges would put additional financial strain on the citizens	1
Concern is payment charges. Would hope there can be a minimum	1
charge approx. 50p for 30 mins to allow people to "pop in" to an	
establishment quickly and easily. Equally if maximum payment charges	
are £1 hour or £5/day, I think more people would pay.	
Elderly people will just not come into the town if these changes are implemented	1
Even though the first hour is going to be free, people will not want the	1
hassle of going to a machine to get a ticket	
Few places for camper van drivers to park in town	1
Has any consideration been given to tradesmen and their livelihood, if	1
these proposals are implemented?	
Highly limited free parking spaces in Salcombe are already a detriment to	1
anyone who lives and works in Salcombe. Further reduction to free parking	
in the town will discourage people who live in neighbouring villages from	
continuing to work for Salcombe's businesses as public transport is	
sporadic and unreliable.	
If a resident has a visitor you are charging them.	1
If the town/village has a Pay & Display car park any on street parking should also be Pay & Display	1
Improve the Park & Ride and ensure it is operating in season.	1

Comment	Count
It will require extra capital investment that the Council doesn't have,	1
reduce footfall into the retailers that are the lifeblood of the community and	
discourage mainly elderly residents from quick journeys to town for	
essentials such as pharmacy visits.	
Large cars which stay in Creek Car Park for a whole week are happy to	1
pay the fine because they can afford to - clamp the car and impose a large	
fine for return.	
Local residents are not super rich. Limit parking to 1 hour, don't charge for	1
the second hour.	4
Many Salcombe residents are elderly and need to be able to drive in their	1
car to access shops. Cost of putting meters that are not suitable for South	
Hams infrastructure plus cost of enforcement will offset any revenue taken in parking fees	
More vehicles driving around searching for spaces will increase emissions.	1
Nearby villages, such as Kingsbridge, still provide opportunities to access	1
High Street shops, pubs and scenic walks without paying for parking on	1
many streets. Many people, both tourists and locals alike, are already	
avoiding Salcombe town centre and its businesses due to cost and	
sparsity of parking spaces.	
Nothing in proposals which will improve the traffic situation in Salcombe.	1
There are better ways of raising revenue without making life more	
complicated for both residents and visitors.	
Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the	1
parking requirements of the residents of affected roads.	
Paid for parking will have to be used mostly by people that need access to	1
home/work and shops.	
Parking meters are detrimental to the look of the town	1
Parking will be made worse not better	1
Please put alternative parking options in place before you restrict what is	1
currently available.	
Respondent does not agree with statement of reasons	1
Respondent feels that it isn't fair to charge people extra on top of the high	1
cost of living in the area	4
Respondent feels there are not enough parking facilities available for	1
workers that work in town Respondent will visit the town less if pay and display is implemented	1
Ridiculous proposals that only benefits tourism which already makes daily	1
life more stressful.	ı
Salcombe is a beautiful place. The monetisation of the town while often	1
important to ensure its financial stability, must not be prioritised over its	'
accessibility and liveability to local residents.	
Salcombe will suffer financially if plans go ahead.	1
SHDC have given planning consent for so many holiday homes to create	1
wide driveways on their front gardens thus reducing on road parking.	

Comment	Count
The bays in Island Street should have much shorter max stay period	1
(suggest 30 mins). Many residents use bays to park when going to Co-op	
to shop. Allowing vehicles to park for up to 2 hrs would significantly reduce	
the available parking opportunities.	
The proposals will increase congestion	1
The respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact parking for	1
locals	
Think there does need a better more inclusive Park & Ride scheme before	1
you change parking on streets.	
This scheme will affect the overall quality of life for those living in the area	1
Unless you provide passes to all the businesses in Salcombe so their staff	1
can park (I had this when I worked in Dartmouth so it is possible) this is not	
fair to the people that work there.	
Will impact residents who do not have off-street parking	1
Will there be resident parking permits available?	1
Would make parking more difficult for hospitality venue workers as they	1
would not like to pay for an hourly charge to park their vehicle. They	
already have to park some distance from their workplace.	
Would the Council also consider overnight (6pm-8am) Motor home parking	1
allocations for £8-£10 as I think this would bring extra funds into the	
location.	

Comment	Count
Sidmouth	
Opposes the proposals	146
Supports the proposals	15
Respondent would like the parking to remain as it is now	36
Respondent feels that pay and display restrictions will have a negative	35
impact on businesses in the town centre	
Respondent feels that the pay and display will discourage people from	29
visiting the town	
Parking meters are detrimental to the look of the town	28
This is just a money making scheme	21
The respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact parking for	16
locals	.0
Respondent feels there will be increased parking in residential areas	15
where spaces are already limited	
The proposals will increase congestion	15
More vehicles driving around searching for spaces will increase emissions.	12
Respondent does not agree with statement of reasons	12
Respondent already struggles to find a space with a residents permit and	9
feels this will only get worse	-
Respondent feels that there are already pay and display car parks nearby	9
which can be used for longer visits.	
Respondent will visit the town less if pay and display is implemented	7
Meters will block pavements and make it harder for the pedestrians,	6
disabled and people with mobility issues	-
Respondent states that Fortfield Terrace is a dead end road with no	6
turning area. Vehicles reverse out onto the main road and vehicles have	
been scratched and buildings damaged	
These proposals will increase turnover	6
It is a regency town, it will spoil it.	5
Once the restrictions are in place, DCC might increase the charges	5
Respondent asks how this will be enforced when its currently not being	5
regularly monitored	
Shops are already struggling	5
Conservation areas should not have street furniture	4
Doubling the parking period will reduce the turnover of vehicles and	4
availability of parking	
Pay & Display in Fortfield Terrace will be one of the cheapest in Sidmouth,	4
this will cause immense parking for residents and members of	
tennis/cricket clubs.	
Respondent comments that this scheme will not benefit the local	4
community	
Respondent feels parking charges are already too high.	4
Respondent feels that it isn't fair to charge people extra on top of the high	4
cost of living in the area	
The proposals will not improve air quality	4
At times the main car parks are full, even in winter. In the summer tourists	3
park here and car parks are often full	

Comment	ount
Existing public transport is poor, people have to use their cars	3
Increased traffic to the area may cause damage to buildings due to drivers	3
manoeuvring poorly	
It's about time the powers that be listen to the residents/town's people	3
what they want /need as it's them that matter not decisions made by	
outsiders.	
Presumably Devon County are aware this is a conservation area?	3
Respondent does not feel that these proposals will increase car turnover	3
Respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact people that work	3
and park in town	
Respondent questions where will the residents park?	3
Respondent requests more enforcement	3
Respondent suggests introducing residents parking permits	3
The proposals will increase the risk of harm to pedestrians and cyclists.	3
The proposals will kill off the town and trade	3
The proposals will not improve congestion	3
The road is dangerous as they don't have pavements and more parked	3
cars will put pedestrians at risk	
Will there be resident parking permits available?	3
Charges would put additional financial strain on workers	2
Congestion is due to the zebra crossing on the Esplanade, not from on-	2
street parking.	
Free parking encourages locals and visitors into the town	2
Hotels rely on the free parking for guests to park near the seafront hotels.	2
Meters will damage the accessibility of the pavements that are already	2
narrow	
Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the	2
parking requirements of the residents of affected roads.	
Pleased to see plans to reduce/restrict car use in town	2
Request for residents parking only in Fortfield Terrace	2
Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents	2
with mobility issues	
Respondent does not feel there is a congestion problem	2
Respondent feels people will choose to shop out of town where parking is	2
free	
Respondent feels there are not enough parking facilities available for workers that work in town	2
respondent feels this is a further tax on motorists	2
Respondent is a business owner and feels that the proposals will	2
negatively affect their business as well as other businesses	2
The proposals will encourage people to shop online The respondent feels the proposals will provide more chance to park for	2
locals, especially the elderly and families	2
This scheme will affect the overall quality of life for those living in the area	2
This will stop cars parking all day on the Esplanade. At most seafronts you	2
have to pay	_
We already pay council tax	2

Comment	Count
What is the money made from on street parking going towards?	2
What problem is trying to be solved by metering spaces that currently are	2
not?	
Assumes this as a tax on enjoyment of those visiting and spending time	1
(and money) in a quality in the resort.	
At times the main car parks are full, this will help to provide additional	1
parking space in town	
Can something be done about Blue Badge Holders parking wherever they choose regularly?	1
Charges made in Devon and Cornwall are exorbitant compared to Northern England where charges are much more realistic and reasonable. These charges are likely designed to rip off tourists as often charges increase in the summer months.	1
Charges will be detrimental to the community	1
Charges would put additional financial strain on the citizens	1
Concern is payment charges. Would hope there can be a minimum charge approx. 50p for 30 mins to allow people to "pop in" to an establishment quickly and easily. Equally if maximum payment charges are £1 hour or £5/day, I think more people would pay.	1
Could the proposals be complemented by development of safer cycling routes and pedestrian only areas in the shopping centre?	1
Councillors have already taken away too much free on street parking from Sidmouth with the implementation of loading bays, taxi ranks and disabled spaces, much of which is not used 90% of the time.	1
Current parking has made the respondent avoid the town	1
Currently relies on people's honesty when unable to park using permit and checks which cars have permits and who is about to leave in existing Limited waiting	1
Hopefully the proposals will ease congestion in town	1
Hopefully the proposals will make parking easier for residents.	1
How much is this costing?	1
How will this proposed scheme measure success?	1
I do not want to pay for parking	1
If machines are installed they need to accept credit cards and cash and not to be solely accessible via a mobile phone app.	1
If the proposals go ahead, it will add 20 minutes on top of an hours commute to work each day	1
If the town/village has a Pay & Display car park any on street parking should also be Pay & Display	1
If you're saying it will improve air quality you're saying fewer people will be in the town.	1
Is this a test case to install a pay machine along our High Street in the future?	1
it seems that the District Council is out of touch with what is required to keep the unique Seaside town	1
It will be very confusing for visitors.	1

Comment	Count
It will bring in some income which could be used to fund and encourage	1
sustainable travel alternatives like walking, cycling, and public transport.	
Money should be spent on fixing the roads	1
Money should be spent on other services	1
Parking is a premium and there are very few opportunities to park for free.	1
Parking meters will mean people will park for longer	1
Partial parking ban has been successful at times that parking is allowed	1
and other times restricted/ not allowed would surely allow a far better	•
experience on the sea front.	
Please see my response for Honiton, as my reasons for opposing this	1
unnecessary proposal are the same.	
Proposals don't address key issues already associated within the area	1
Provide free parking in the winter months	1
Requesting a permit to park on the seafront if the proposals go ahead	1
Require local sports clubs to make permanent on-site parking provision for	1
its members; closer regulation/verification of parking permits which are	•
'acquired' by club members.	
Respondent asking how tradesman will access and park along Fortfield	1
Terrace	•
Respondent asks if there are any proposals relating to the cost of annual	1
permits, included in this proposal due to the reduction of available parking	
spaces	
Respondent believes the proposals have errors and are legally	1
challengeable, no mention of 30 mins free or the no return within 1 hour on	
draft order and statement of reasons	
Respondent comments that elderly and disabled residents use the on-	1
street parking to access local businesses, many cannot walk far and may	
find it difficult getting a ticket	
Respondent comments that the cost outlay is not justified	1
Respondent does not object to the restrictive parking measures proposed	1
on The Esplanade and Fortfield Terrace as this would align these streets	
with the High Street and Fore Street. However, they do object to it being	
pay and display	
Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	1
eventually being reduced to 30 min, then none at all.	
Respondent feels DCC's proposals lack clarity	1
Respondent feels like this is income generation with little or no regard for	1
residents	
respondent feels meters will decrease revenue as this will drive people	1
away	
Respondent feels that the proposals will pose potential challenges that	1
could adversely affect our community's economic landscape	
Respondent feels the loading bays should be available to park in after 6pm	1
to allow customers to support local pubs and restaurants	
Respondent feels the proposal is unreasonable for people with mobility	1
issues that do not have a disabled badge	
Respondent feels the proposals will increase the town's visitors	1

Comment	Count
Respondent feels the proposals will not make any difference to pollution or	1
pedestrian safety	
Respondent feels there are no issues with air quality	1
Respondent feels there are too many loading only spaces in town that are	1
empty all night and asks to make these available all night and day as	
before (with short term in the day)	
Respondent feels there is a shortage of parking spaces available and this	1
needs addressing before implementing pay and display	
Respondent feels there is not enough free parking as it is	1
Respondent feels this appears to be a further residents and visitors tax	1
Respondent refuses to pay for this as a tax payer	1
Respondent reports that there is not enough available on-street parking in	1
the town centre	
Respondent reports that there is not much available off-street parking in	1
the town centre	
Respondent requests evidence to support the proposals	1
Respondent requests free parking permits for residents	1
Respondent says parking spaces won't be big enough for 4x4 vehicles or	1
vans	•
Respondent says the proposals discriminates against and affects the least	1
well-off and vulnerable people	•
Respondent says there is no evidence presented to support the proposal's	1
objectives	•
Respondent says there is no financial benefit for the town commerce or	1
residences	-
Respondent suggests improving the car parks	1
Respondent suggests limiting the free parking in some areas to 30 minutes	1
Respondent suggests more buses to and from the town	1
Respondent suggests more local research is needed	1
Respondent supports proposal to extend free parking to 1 hour	1
Respondent works in town and feels they won't be able to use on street	1
parking to park for work anymore	
Ridiculous proposals that only benefits tourism which already makes daily	1
life more stressful.	
Shift workers will feel more vulnerable if having to walk further away,	1
especially at night	'
Short free parking allows locals & visitors a chance to pop into the town &	1
shop local	'
Sidmouth is not allowed to have a pelican crossing due to it being a	1
conservation area, why should pay and display be implemented?	ı
Since the local council doubled the cost of parking in town we have seen	1
	ı
these charges have had a detrimental effect on our business	1
Some consideration of pedestrians needs in the town generally would be welcome.	ı
The cheap parking will attract more people	1
	1 1
The High Street is inaccessible for wheelchair users as pavements are too	I
arrow and it favours cars	

Comment	Count
The hotels have front terraces where visitors and residents sit, along with	1
people on the promenade, none of whom wish to be subjected to more	
unhealthy exhaust in the sea air	
The max stay should be increased	1
The max stay should remain at 2 hours	1
The meters on Peak Hill are not practical for those wanting to visit the	1
beach all do, either remove them or, preferably, extend the time period.	
The only long stay car park is too far away and will not be able to carry	1
heavy shopping for such a long distance	
The proposals will negatively impact tourism.	1
The respondent feels the proposals will force people to park	1
inappropriately elsewhere	
The respondent suggests that we need to monitor surrounding streets if	1
proposals go ahead as displaced parking may warrant expanding	
residents parking areas and areas where key workers can find parking at a	
fair price	
The seafront should be pedestrian focused	1
The town is in an AONB and the sea front makes a significant contribution	1
to that.	
There were proposed plans for these back in 2011 which DDC did a U	1
Turn on after the consultation period which all of the towns back then	
objected to and we believe these same towns are objecting again.	
These proposals are a waste of money	1
This is an area with a lot of retired residents and the idea that you are	1
going to encourage to get people on their bikes or walk is unrealistic	
This is just a bureaucratic exercise, this scheme will have no benefits in	1
this location.	
This scheme will not achieve goals set out in the Statement of Reasons.	1
Traders/shops who are face to face and speak daily with shoppers oppose	1
the plan saying it will negatively affect their business. Why would Council	
planners deliberately make a decision that is highly likely to cause a down	
turn in trade? Surely this is counterproductive.	
who will be responsible for paying for damage caused by vehicles	1
Would be interesting to see the Equality Impact Assessment on these	1
proposed restrictions as it will mean disabled people would not be able to	
park near to the Esplanade for any significant period of time.	
Would the Council also consider overnight (6pm-8am) motor home parking	1
allocations for £8-£10 as I think this would bring extra funds into the	
location	

Comment	Count
Tavistock	
Opposes the proposals	2206
Supports the proposals	24
Respondent feels that pay and display restrictions will have a negative	1026
impact on businesses in the town centre	
Respondent feels that the pay and display will discourage people from	596
visiting the town	
Respondent would like the parking to remain as it is now	487
This is just a money making scheme	227
Parking meters are detrimental to the look of the town	157
Proposals will deter people from coming into town, they will use	156
supermarkets instead	4.40
Respondent feels people will choose to shop out of town where parking is	149
free Respondent will visit the town loss if now and display is implemented.	142
Respondent will visit the town less if pay and display is implemented	143
Doubling the parking period will reduce the turnover of vehicles and availability of parking	109
The proposals will kill off the town and trade	95
Respondent feels that there are already pay and display car parks nearby	89
which can be used for longer visits.	09
Respondent reports 2 hour stay is not needed and will reduce the car	89
turnover	00
Respondent does not agree with statement of reasons	85
Respondent feels there will be payment problems for elderly people who	51
don't use payment apps or smart phones	
Once the restrictions are in place, DCC might increase the charges	50
Respondent feels there will be increased parking in residential areas	46
where spaces are already limited	
The proposals will not improve air quality	46
Respondent says there is no evidence presented to support the proposal's	42
objectives	
The proposals will encourage people to shop online	42
The proposals will not improve congestion	40
Shops are already struggling	38
Free parking encourages locals and visitors into the town	33
It will spoil the whole look of Tavistock especially as we are a world	32
heritage site	
Meters will block pavements and make it harder for the pedestrians,	32
disabled and people with mobility issues	
The proposals will increase congestion	32
Parking meters will mean people will park for longer	30
Respondent does not feel there is a congestion problem	29
The proposals will penalise locals who already struggle with the cost of	27
living Respondent is a business owner and feels that the proposals will	26
Respondent is a business owner and feels that the proposals will negatively affect their business as well as other businesses	20
negatively affect their publicess as well as other pusifiesses	

Comment	Count
Meters will damage the accessibility of the pavements that are already	25
narrow	
Respondent comments that the changes will discourage people who just	22
want to pop into the shops quickly	
Charges would put additional financial strain on the citizens	21
Respondent requests evidence to support the proposals	21
I do not want to pay for parking	20
Respondent does not feel that these proposals will increase car turnover	20
The respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact parking for locals	18
More vehicles driving around searching for spaces will increase emissions.	17
respondent feels this is a further tax on motorists	17
Inconvenience and time wasted while paying for parking, and disruption from defective ticket machines	16
there has been no evidence provided that the current restrictions don't	16
work.	4 =
Money wasted on installing the meters and maintaining them	15
Respondent feels it is unfair that people can only respond by using the	15
online form. This is not fair to those who do not use the internet.	
Even though the first hour is going to be free, people will not want the	14
hassle of going to a machine to get a ticket	
Access to town shops will be limited and costly to elderly population	13
Short free parking allows locals & visitors a chance to pop into the town & shop local	13
Charges will be detrimental to the community	12
Respondent comments that this scheme will not benefit the local community	12
The proposed charges will prevent people using the off-street car parks	12
The respondent feels the proposals will force people to park	12
nappropriately elsewhere	
Respondent raises objection to this consultation happening at the busiest time of the year for customers and traders	11
Elderly people may get confused when using the machines	10
Existing public transport is poor, people have to use their cars	10
Parking charges will affect the short term shoppers	10
Meters are costly to install.	9
Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues	9
Respondent feels that it isn't fair to charge people extra on top of the high cost of living in the area	9
Respondent feels there are no issues with air quality	9
Respondent feels there are no issues with all quality	9
Tavistock has many independent shops and has so much to offer for locals	9
and visitors and need help to bring in customers to keep going	
There may be payment issues due to poor mobile and/or internet signal in the town centre	9
These proposals are a waste of money	9

<u>8</u> 8
8
•
8
8
7
7
7
7
7
7
6
6
6
6
6
6
6
6
6
6
6
5
5
5
5
5
5
5 5
5 5
ິບ

Comment	Count
There is no evidence supporting the claim that it will improve air quality.	5
Councils must not force people to use smartphones to pay for parking	4
DCC might make the pay and display machines cashless in the future	4
If machines are installed, they need to accept credit cards and cash and	4
not to be solely accessible via a mobile phone app.	
It is a waste of public money	4
Low income families are really going to struggle with the new proposed	4
changes to parking.	
No publication of cost v return (cost/benefit analysis). This should be	4
mandatory.	
Respondent comments that local residents are unlikely to pay for parking	4
in their own town	
Respondent comments that the money collected is unlikely to offset the	4
cost of installation and maintenance	
Respondent feels that the town is already dying	4
Respondent feels the proposal is unreasonable for people with mobility	4
issues that do not have a disabled badge	
Respondent feels the proposed 1 hour free parking will cause confusion	4
with people being unsure as to whether or not they need to get a parking	
ticket if they are staying for under 1 hour	
Respondent feels this appears to be a further residents and visitors tax	4
Respondent requests more enforcement	4
Respondent says not everyone can pay by phone or have the correct	4
change	
Respondent says the proposals discriminates against and affects the least	4
well-off and vulnerable people	
Respondent would like to know payment options available	4
The proposals will negatively impact tourism.	4
We already pay council tax	4
Cashless parking creates an impossible barrier for those without	3
smartphones.	
Elderly people will just not come into the town if these changes are	3
implemented	
Granite slab pavements which are historic in Tavistock and are listed will	3
be ruined by parking meters being installed.	
It's about time the powers that be listen to the residents/town's people	3
what they want /need as it's them that matter not decisions made by	
outsiders.	
Locals will be using the parking spaces more than visitors to the town	3
Respondent asks how long will it take to recoup the outlay on installing the	3
meters.	
Respondent comments that parking is already difficult for disabled people	3
and these changes will make matters worse for the disabled community	
respondent feels a park and ride would be more beneficial	3
Respondent suggests better communication and engagement with town	3
councils	
Respondent suggests investing into electric charging points	3

Comment	Count
Respondent suggests to create a pedestrian zone in the main High street	3
Respondent would like to know how the blue badge holders will be	3
affected by the proposals and will there be more or less disabled spaces.	
The requirement for parking meters will cause extra obstructions on	3
pavements often outside private houses.	
The respondent questions the reasons why this proposal is being	3
introduced	
The respondent suggests the first 2 hours should be free	3
This plan goes against the core values of Tavistock and the surrounding	3
area as a community which supports its town and values its local	
businesses	
We should be supporting local businesses by facilitating ease of access	3
Will impact residents who do not have off-street parking	3
1 hour Free parking and the option to pay for 2 hours parking will allow for	2
more flexible shopping and a turnover of cars	
Any income gained from increased meter use will be offset by the need to	2
employ additional traffic wardens to monitor the parking situation.	
As the first hour is free, the small charge for the second hour is a great	2
idea.	
Concentrate on fixing existing parking like no lifts and no lights in brook	2
street carpark	
Congestion in Tavistock is because it's the main route to and from	2
Plymouth, not from parking issues.	
Current parking has made the respondent avoid the town	2
Failure to carry out a full Heritage Impact Assessment in the case of the	2
World Heritage Site specifically would leave the scheme open to review by	
UNESCO via their advisers ICOMOS as part of the current round of State	
of Conservation reporting that the CMWHS Office has to provide.	
How much is this costing?	2
If this was a serious attempt to reduce pollution and congestion within	2
Tavistock town centre as well as improve safety for all then surely the	
proposal should be for complete pedestrianisation of the area.	
If you're saying it will improve air quality you're saying fewer people will be	2
in the town.	
It is a regency town, it will spoil it.	2
It is not clear how any money raised will benefit the town or its shoppers	2
and businesses.	
No consideration of disabled drivers.	2
Not all road users have online facilities to pay for parking and with	2
reducing bank outlets/cashpoints in town finding parking funds just adds	
another frustration	
Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the	2
parking requirements of the residents of affected roads.	
Proof is what has happened in Callington and Cornwall Council have	2
admitted that it is the biggest drop in foot fall, most of the small	
independent shops have closed and I feel this is what will happen with	
Tavistock	

Comment	Count
Proposals do not take into account the view of, or the survey carried out by	2
Tavistock Business Improvement District (BID Co)	
Proposals may increase crime and vandalism in the area	2
Respondent asks, has the Council carried out an economic assessment of	2
the impact on shops and the town centre as a whole?	
Respondent comments that elderly and disabled residents use the on-	2
street parking to access local businesses, many cannot walk far and may	
find it difficult getting a ticket	
Respondent comments that the current situation brings people into the	2
town which keeps the shops going in the current economic climate	
Respondent comments that the proposals are not wanted/ not required	2
Respondent comments that the scheme is not relevant, as the stated	2
benefits will not work at this location	
Respondent feels DCC's proposals lack clarity	2
respondent feels meters will decrease revenue as this will drive people	2
away	
Respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact people that work	2
and park in town	
Respondent feels the same proposals are being applied across different	2
towns without consideration for their individual circumstances	
respondent feels this will impact the poor far greater than the wealthy	2
Respondent opposes to pay for the parking where they live.	2
Respondent questions where will the residents park?	2
Respondent requests free parking permits for residents	2
Respondent says they are disabled and on a limited income as are a lot of	2
Tavistock residents and feel persecuted for supporting their local town	
Respondent suggests adding more free parking to boost the local	2
economy.	
Respondent suggests exploring alternative solutions such as improved	2
signage, designated parking areas, and time limited parking zones	<u> </u>
Respondent suggests improving the car parks	2
Respondent suggests limiting the free parking in some areas to 30 minutes	2
Ridiculous proposals that only benefits tourism which already makes daily	2
life more stressful.	
Seeing a civil enforcement officer walking around puts me off parking in	2
case I over run my stay	_
Tavistock is a beautiful town but needs its high street shops and market to	2
survive	
The Borough Council considers that the proposals fail to consider properly	2
the social, economic and environmental implications of introducing	
charges for on-street parking	
The council don't do anything with the money we give them already our	2
town's roads are shocking	
The current parking restrictions encourage easy access for less able	2
bodied and elderly shoppers who do not qualify for a disability badge.	2
The proposals will increase the risk of harm to pedestrians and cyclists.	2
There will be extra expense of installing and running of the scheme	2

Comment	Count
There's not sufficient long stay pay and display spaces	2
This is not a cost-effective use of public funds	2
This scheme affects the Cornwall and West Devon Mining Landscape	2
World Heritage Site, the Tavistock Conservation Area and a number of	_
Listed Buildings.	
We are mostly rural so rely on Tavistock for most of our shopping needs.	2
West Devon Borough Council is requesting a face-to-face meeting with the	2
County Council, Borough Council, Okehampton and Tavistock Town	_
Councils and other key stakeholders	
What is the money made from on street parking going towards?	2
When budgets are tight, the cost of installing a parking system with no	2
benefit is totally unnecessary.	_
Will affect those with compromised mobility but not eligible for a Blue	2
Badge.	
Will now have to pay to provide care to vulnerable patients who require	2
home visits	
Worries about price increases, meters not working	2
Worries about the cost and disruption of fitting and maintaining the metres.	2
You'll lose out eventually by not having income from business rates	2
A full Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) is required as well as plans to	1
show what development/infrastructure is required as part of this scheme in	
order to assess the potential impacts upon these designated heritage	
assets.	
A well positioned and affordable Park and Ride system is the obvious	1
choice for reducing pollution, increasing access, possible	
pedestrianisation, improved road safety and improving the look of the town	
by removing the wall of parked cars currently lining most town roads.	
Adding more charges for parking throughout the town will limit those who	1
cannot afford to pay parking charges from accessing the town centre.	
Air Quality will gradually get better as electric vehicles are adopted	1
Are you going to borrow this money and what interest against the income	1
of	
Scheme?	
As an owner of a small business where we are going to park our car?	1
As DCC is doing this across Devon & not only Tavistock the respondent	1
see's it purely as a fund raising exercise with no regard for the locals	
anywhere.	
At this time there seems to be no detailed plans as to where the meters	1
will be located and what effect they may have on pavement width	
restrictions (1200mm is required)	
Better signage to 'long stay' car parks would help visitors who are likely to	1
stay more than 2 hours.	
Car parks at Meadows, Abbey Bridge & Pixon Lane should be made free.	1
Cashless payment is not always easier	1

Comment	Count
Charges made in Devon and Cornwall are exorbitant compared to	1
Northern England where charges are much more realistic and reasonable.	
These charges are likely designed to rip off tourists as often charges	
increase in the summer months.	
Charges would put additional financial strain on workers	1
Close Duke Street to cars	1
Concern is payment charges. Would hope there can be a minimum	1
charge approx. 50p for 30 mins to allow people to "pop in" to an	
establishment quickly and easily. Equally if maximum payment charges	
are £1 hour or £5/day, I think more people would pay.	
Conservation areas should not have street furniture	1
Council needs to understand that small business needs a level playing	1
field	
DCC fails to recognise that responsibility for energy and transport planning	1
and provision is to be ceded to Regional Energy Strategic Planning groups	
within 12-months	
DCC has not amended its proposals to accommodate Government Policy	1
for fully autonomous transport (Level-4). Introduction of autonomous pods	
should be prioritised over parking places for private cars	
DCC should listen to Town Councils as they oppose the proposals	1
Devon County Council has not provided a plan of costs which shows how	1
surplus funds (after improved enforcement) will be used to offset the local	
service costs or how much the scheme will cost and how it is funded	
Doing away with free parking may encourage people to drive further thus	1
increasing the carbon footprint	
Don't try and champion your cycling routes because the only safe one is to	1
the edge of Plymouth, the rest are along busy roads.	
Enforcement will be costly	1
Everyone wants to keep our lovely independent shops	1
If you want to increase town centre parking then redevelop the current	1
eyesore that was the site of the old Woolworths building into short term	
parking.	
Failed to consult with WDBC Conservation Officer or Council	1
Archaeologist to see how the proposals will impact on the Tavistock CA &	
WHS and OUV	
Failure to carry out a full Heritage Impact Assessment could threaten the	1
status of the WHS if not subject to full HIA and any harm that may result	
from this lack of assessment.	
Focus should be on road safety around the new estates, namely speed	1
cameras or speed bumps on Callington Road, where we walk our kids to	
school whilst cars fly down at 60mph with no consequences.	
For those with no mobility issues it will drive cars into residential areas,	1
thereby discriminating against those who have limited mobility	
Further advice should be sought on this matter with the relevant adviser in	1
DCC Archaeology unit, West Devon Borough Council's conservation	
specialists and the CMWHS Office (in relation to full Heritage Impact	
Assessment).	

Comment	Count
Have DCC produced any costings in relation to this proposed exercise? If	1
so, please can the information be made public? If not, why not?	
Housing developments in the Tavistock and surrounding area have not	1
been matched with public transport investments.	
How about using the money it would cost to install the meters to supply	1
shops with fold away mobility ramps, providing better access for those with	
limited mobility?	
How does designating paid parking spaces on the highway maintain free	1
movement of traffic and reasonable access to premises?	4
How many additional management and other staff will this scheme add up to?	1
	1
I am a Pensioner having to pay would impact a lot on my finances. I believe it to be so detrimental to businesses on the High Street, to the	<u> </u>
degree that we are currently evaluating whether we should risk renewing	ı
our lease.	
I feel that once the machines are in the 1 hour free parking will go.	1
I oppose the installation of payment meters in the centre of our historic	 1
town.	•
I suggest that the number of disabled places should be cut, as often you	1
go into Tavistock and see 4 empty disabled places and then the blue	
badge holders using, (as is their right) the single yellow lines to park.	
I suspect that the true objective(s) of these proposals have been	1
intentionally omitted and that these include increased parking revenues.	
I would also resent paying on a street which is riddled with potholes which	1
has cost me money damaging my car.	
I would propose that the council spend time considering other resolutions	1
to reduce pollution (such as encouraging EV vehicles by installing	
chargers).	
If a parking fee was charged for the supermarkets would they get as many	1
customers?	
If income generation is needed to cover shortfalls due to lack of	1
government funding then please be open and honest as I think people will	
review differently If maximum payment charges are £1 hour or £5 per day, respondent thinks	1
more people would pay.	1
If the Council has not observed the destruction of nearly every other high	1
street with such an ill thought move then they need to do the research	•
urgently	
If this is to be monitored it will need a full time warden at extra cost to the	1
taxpayer in addition to the cost of installing the meters.	
If you persist in trying to fit meters there will be legal challenges that may	1
delay installation for years and end up costing Authorities which local tax	
payers will end up having to pay.	
If you were really concerned about the environment then you would do	1
something about the appalling river water quality in Devon	
If you wish to reduce traffic through the town, better to alter traffic flows	1
and speeds, and improve routes which bypass the town centre.	

local businesses, town centres and encourage visitors, rough Council have not raised their car parking charges ar park from £2.00 to £2.50 for 4 hours to generate extra 1 s of raising funding, just increase rates instead 1
ear park from £2.00 to £2.50 for 4 hours to generate extra
ear park from £2.00 to £2.50 for 4 hours to generate extra
s of raising funding just increase rates instead 1
g meters is a deterrent, not an enticement 1
-
ine to all efficient for proposal. I shall expect a recorded vote
d and the results published in local papers.
make sure there is always both paid for and free parking 1
people.
e people who need more time in the town centre who are
long distances to car parks
dent shops that make Tavistock different and why people 1
centre (including the market square) a traffic free zone
re parking outside the centre
ongestion by driving visitors away from Tavistock and cause 1
slose.
pent on improving the multi-storey car par at the end of 1
ed isn't enough to warrant such action 1
ng should be added on selected days to encourage people 1
centre.
own in Devon & Cornwall.
has been provided as to how footfall in the town centre will 1
session has been made to people living within Tavistock. 1
e abuse the use of the free hour that is currently available 1
•
nity that is not wanted by locals
ar park is often abused by customers who don't shop with 1
will increase if the proposals are implemented
arly find it difficult to find spaces when dropping off and 1
children as parking is prohibited outside the St Rumon's C
ristock
s make my ability to visit patients on time very difficult. I will 1
·
he disabled, blind, and impaired aging populous of which
·
In the standard of the standar

Petition received from Tavistock BID with 164 signatures Please prioritise the residents - not just the retired, but also the hardworking businesses and their needs Pleased to see plans to reduce/restrict car use in town 1 Proposal will be detrimental to pedestrian safety, I firmly believe motorists may well travel faster down Duke Street Proposals should encourage people to get out of cars and walk & cycle instead. Benefit health. Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall Proposals will cause light pollution Requesting a permit to park on the seafront if the proposals go ahead Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality 1 Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons 1 Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks where a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the proposals will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current stituation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments	Comment	Count
Please prioritise the residents - not just the retired, but also the hardworking businesses and their needs Pleased to see plans to reduce/restrict car use in town 1 Proposal will be detrimental to pedestrian safety, I firmly believe motorists may well travel faster down Duke Street Proposals should encourage people to get out of cars and walk & cycle instead. Benefit health. Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall 1 Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall 1 Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall 1 Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall 1 Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall 1 Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality 1 Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality 1 Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons 1 Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? 1 Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the proposals will create more traffic as people will to their mental health Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent doments that th		1
Pleased to see plans to reduce/restrict car use in town Pleased to see plans to reduce/restrict car use in town Proposal will be detrimental to pedestrian safety, I firmly believe motorists may well travel faster down Duke Street Proposals should encourage people to get out of cars and walk & cycle instead. Benefit health. Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall Proposals will cause light pollution Requesting a permit to park on the seafront if the proposals go ahead Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons 1 Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that the proposals will rot improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent does not feel that there		1
Proposal will be detrimental to pedestrian safety, I firmly believe motorists may well travel faster down Duke Street Proposals should encourage people to get out of cars and walk & cycle instead. Benefit health. Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall 1 Proposals will cause light pollution Requesting a permit to park on the seafront if the proposals go ahead 1 Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality 1 Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons 1 Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? 1 Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? 1 Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested be people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
may well travel faster down Duke Street Proposals should encourage people to get out of cars and walk & cycle instead. Benefit health. Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall 1 Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall 1 Proposals will cause light pollution 1 Requesting a permit to park on the seafront if the proposals go ahead 1 Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality 1 Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons 1 Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons 1 Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? 1 Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? 1 Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement 1 Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes 1 Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility 1 Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area 1 Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health 1 Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people 1 will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads 1 Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current 1 situation and will only make things worse 1 Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their 1 premises 1 Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes 1 will reduce their use of nearby shops. 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent does not feel	Pleased to see plans to reduce/restrict car use in town	1
Proposals should encourage people to get out of cars and walk & cycle instead. Benefit health. Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall 1 Proposals will cause light pollution Requesting a permit to park on the seafront if the proposals go ahead 1 Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality 1 Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? 1 Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? 1 Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 2 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up	Proposal will be detrimental to pedestrian safety, I firmly believe motorists	1
Instead. Benefit health. Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall 1 Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall 1 Proposals will cause light pollution Requesting a permit to park on the seafront if the proposals go ahead 1 Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality 1 Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons 1 Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 2 Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	may well travel faster down Duke Street	
Proposals will affect events like farmers market and Butchers Hall Proposals will cause light pollution Requesting a permit to park on the seafront if the proposals go ahead 1 Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality 1 Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons 1 Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? 1 Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? 1 Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? 1 Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	1
Proposals will cause light pollution Requesting a permit to park on the seafront if the proposals go ahead Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 mespondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 2 mespondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 3 mespondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up		
Requesting a permit to park on the seafront if the proposals go ahead Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? 1 Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up		1
Respondent agrees proposals will increase air quality Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks where a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that lederly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 mespondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 2 nespondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up	<u> </u>	
Respondent agrees with the statement of reasons Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? 1 Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		1
Respondent asks how do the restrictions preserve or improve the amenities of the area? Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? 1 Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 2 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		<u> </u>
Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? 1 Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	· · · · · ·	<u> </u>
Respondent asks how motorcycles would be catered for under the new proposals? Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? 1 Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		1
Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? 1 Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 3 Respondent comments that the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set 1 Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC, 1		4
Respondent asks where will the revenue be reinvested in? Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		1
Respondent asks whether a survey has been conducted to determine the impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? 1 Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		1
impacts the proposals will have on disabled and vulnerable people - they believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	-	1
believe this may be a legal requirement Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	ı
Respondent asks why is payment required for short stays? Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC, 1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Respondent asks will DCC provide details of the number of people who support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC, 1		1
support and the number of people who oppose the proposed changes Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC, 1		1
Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking area because of their mobility Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		'
Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC, 1		1
Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it more difficult to access shops in the area Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	•
Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		1
disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		
to their mental health Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	Respondent comments that the added hassle of getting a ticket may deter	1
Respondent comments that the changes will create more traffic as people will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	disabled people from wanting to go out, so could end up being detrimental	
will to try and find a free space on the surrounding roads Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		
Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current situation and will only make things worse Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		1
Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary 1 Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no 1 sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set 1 up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC, 1	-	
Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		1
Premises Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		
Respondent comments that they have limited mobility and these changes will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	· ·	1
will reduce their use of nearby shops. Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	•	4
Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC, 1	, ,	7
Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,	• • •	1
sense. It's not what the residents of the area want. Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC,		1
Respondent does not feel that there will be much change to the current set up Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC, 1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1
Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC, 1		1
Respondent feels 1 hour free parking will be "open to abuse" by DCC, 1		1
		1
	eventually being reduced to 30 min, then none at all.	•

Comment	Count
Respondent feels installing on street P&D adjacent to two town surgeries	1
would impact resident's ability to access medical treatment	
Respondent feels it will cause too much disruption to residents while the	1
scheme is being implemented	
Respondent feels like this is income generation with little or no regard for	1
residents	
Respondent feels no research has been undertaken into how this plan will	1
improve the community or have a positive impact on the environment.	4
Respondent feels on street parking in shopping areas should be limited to 1 hour	1
Respondent feels parking charges are already too high.	1
Respondent feels parking charges are already too high. Respondent feels parking meters will cause inconvenience to loading and	1
unloading	I
Respondent feels that as a career in the community they will likely be	1
rushed, trying to keep tight deadlines and likely forget to get a ticket which	
would result in a fine.	
Respondent feels that pay and display will have a positive impact on	1
businesses in the town centre	
Respondent feels that the meters will be vandalised	1
Respondent feels that the proposals will affect access for the elderly and	1
disabled, as it will take them longer to carry out their business than the	
suggested free parking times Respondent feels the proposals will reduce short parking ability by	1
extending to two hours rather than one present	I
Respondent feels the proposals will undermine the objectives of the Local	1
Transport Plan	'
Respondent feels the proposed parking charges are too high	1
Respondent feels there are not enough parking facilities available for	1
workers that work in town	
Respondent feels your raising money at the cost of local communities	1
Respondent finds it disrespectful that in the areas you plan to put parking	1
meters there are three churches in that area and as a religious person I	
would have to pay now to park my car just to go to church.	
Respondent questions how far apart the meters will be, as the road is	1
pretty long and will be difficult for elderly and disabled people to access.	
Respondent refuses to pay for this as a tax payer	1
Respondent reports parking issues and no effort to solve them around the	1
Market street Co-Op - parking on pavements, double yellow lines, double	
parking, blocking the road Perpendent reports that there is not much available off street parking in	1
Respondent reports that there is not much available off-street parking in the town centre	I
Respondent reports West Devon Borough Council, Tavistock Town	1
Council, Tavistock BID and Tavistock Chamber of Commerce are all	
opposing the plan	
Respondent requests 30 min free parking in Duke, Brook and West Street	1
and accurate enforcing of the mentioned streets to support businesses	

Comment	Count
Respondent says money would be better spent on employment and	1
increased CEO presence	
Respondent says parking spaces won't be big enough for 4x4 vehicles or	1
vans	
Respondent says the abuse of loading bays should be better monitored	1
Respondent says the proposals would lead people to double park when	1
shoppers' short term parking spaces are blocked with 2 hour parkers	
Respondent says there will be a negative environmental impact with all	1
those unnecessary paper tickets the machine will produce	
Respondent says they would support the proposals if evidence of benefits	1
to introducing charges to increase availability of spaces could be brought	
forward	
Respondent says this directive is counterintuitive to a thriving community	1
Respondent states that more enforcement would be required so cost to	1
residents would increase	
Respondent states that the car parks are always full so don't need to	1
charge for on street parking as well	
Respondent states the proposals will make it harder for people to shop	1
local	
Respondent suggests adding a car park with a shuttle outside the town as	1
it would increase revenue, allow less parking on the streets	
Respondent suggests charging 2nd home owners higher council tax rates	1
to increase revenue	
Respondent suggests creating a car free zone	1
Respondent suggests creating a car park for the residents and a Park &	1
Ride.	
Respondent suggests creating an out of town Park & Ride, it would lessen	1
the volume of traffic coming through town	
Respondent suggests increasing WDBC tax to "raise funds, rather than installing P&D meters	1
Respondent suggests introducing parking discs to control parking instead	1
of P&D	1
Respondent suggests introducing residents parking permits	1
Respondent suggests making Duke Street/Brook Street and West Street	1
pedestrianised for market day (Friday) and/or Saturdays, especially in the	
summer months	
Respondent suggests parking restriction should not extend past 5pm as	1
very few people visit this late in the day	
Respondent suggests proposals should be advertised to reach a wider	1
audience through local press, radio and tv	
Respondent suggests shared spaces for pedestrians and vehicles	1
Respondent supports proposal to extend free parking to 1 hour	1
Respondent wonders how the proposals will create a safer environment	1
Respondent works in town and feels they won't be able to use on street	1
parking to park for work anymore	

Comment	Count
Respondent would encourage a thorough and transparent assessment	1
that takes into account the potential economic repercussions on the local	
businesses	
Respondent would rather have off-street car park charges raised and	1
retain free on-street parking.	
Respondent states there should be policies that protect small towns and	1
village centres, core to the policy should be free/low cost parking	
Restrictions should be introduced to prevent blue badge holders using	1
spaces for longer than everyone else, plenty of other places they can stay	
for free	4
Revenue gained could support other amenities such as public toilets which	1
have been an issue in recent times.	4
Ruin my ability to use services and shops in Tavistock	1
Safe cycle routes in and around the town do not exist	1
Second tier could be added to part of Bedford car Park or Abbey Rise. It is sad to see the circling of cars looking for space at prime seasons to stop	1
and spend in our town and then driving out and away disappointed.	
Since the local council doubled the cost of parking in town we have seen	1
these charges have had a detrimental effect on our business	ı
Some drivers simply park for free in Abbey Surgery car park and walk off	1
to the shops, thereby leaving no spaces for people with doctor's	•
appointments, perhaps that should be prevented.	
Some elderly people cannot carry large amounts of shopping and will go	1
back and forth to their car, lack of free parking will mean they have to shop	
elsewhere.	
Sort out WDBC and their car parks first of all before imposing unwanted	1
road furniture (signs, machines) and charges.	
Suggest the crossings in Tavistock are converted to zebra crossings rather	1
than courtesy.	
Suggests alternative income stream by installing traffic calming measures	1
on Whitchurch Road.	_
Supports idea of increasing revenue from on road parking	1
Supports proposals if the parking is for one hour only.	1
Tavistock Access Group fought to have 9 designated Disabled Parking	1
bays for residents in Plymouth Road, Duke Street and West Street, will these remain if meters are installed?	
Tavistock enjoys the rollover of visitors who can park up for a quick hour or	1
so, relish in the delights of the Town and help boost the economy.	'
Tavistock is a country town that is already over policed by wardens,	1
however if the system allowed an hour free then charged residents could	'
use the spaces all day without fear of a ticket!	
Tavistock is not particularly inviting as it is as due to lack of relevant shops	1
and services (such as banks)	
Tavistock needs a long-term transport, a renewed emphasis on frequent	1
affordable public transport and free shuttle services into town centres	
would be a start	

Comment	Count
Tavistock prides itself on its local community and independent shops, who	1
have done so well despite the financial crisis.	
Tavistock thrives on small shops footfall and tourists	1
Tavistock Town Council objects in the strongest terms to the DCC	1
proposal for the detailed reasons as set out in the accompanying letter,	
despatched by first class post, recorded delivery, and dated 4th January	
2024.	
The biggest contributor to both these issues is the significant amount of	1
housing development on the outskirts of town that has massively	
increased the amount of traffic, congestion and air quality.	
The carbon footprint of installing and maintaining the parking meters and	1
signage outweighs the benefits.	
The council are already forcing out small businesses due to the incredibly	1
high business rates	
The council could consider measures to improve areas for pedestrians and	1
enable a free flow of traffic	
The council is trying to encourage less use of cars, however this is when	1
local transport is inadequate	
The council needs to be building trust with locals, not looking like they are	1
wanting yet more revenue for their decreasing services.	
The establishment of marked bays with parking meters will reduce the	1
number of cars able to park in the town centre because of the necessary	
size of bays.	
The existing businesses in the town centre do not report a problem with	1
the restrictions as they are	
The installation of parking meters throughout our UNESCO World Heritage	1
site town will detract from Tavistock's beauty and charm.	
The meters will be offensive in a town of cultural heritage, which we are	1
committed to maintaining its identity.	
The Parking Meter concept is 50 years out of date and has no part in	1
forward-thinking strategic planning for this region.	
The proposal fails to meet the basic requirements of section 45 of the	1
Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984	
The proposals don't create more spaces	1
The proposals will make residents parking much more difficult, as	1
someone who lives on Bannawell Street it is already incredibly difficult at	
times to park there, and introducing parking meters will make it almost	
impossible.	
The public should not be paying to fund council money making schemes	1
as this is what it is.	
The respondent states they have never had a problem parking in town	1
The survey, carried out by local traders, indicates that 88 percent of	1
shoppers are likely to either avoid the town completely or reduce the	
amount of time they spend visiting if parking charges are implemented.	
The use of paper tickets is environmentally unfriendly and increases	1
littering.	

Comment	Count
There is no evidence to suggest that paid parking maintains free	1
movement of traffic better than the existing limited waiting	
There will be no environmental benefit as a result of the proposals and no	1
impact on emissions	
There will be significant damage to the local environment in order to fit	1
parking meters	
These charges are likely designed to rip off tourists as often charges	1
increase in the summer months. We need a tourist industry.	
These proposals will take away the joy and freedom of living in our own	1
town for the purpose of profiteering to better the town for tourists only	
This proposal ignores "The Law of Unintended Consequences"	1
This proposal will reduce the amount that off-street parking is used.	1
This scheme will affect the overall quality of life for those living in the area	1
this will reduce short term parking	1
This would penalise local people from parking in the town and pushing	1
them to park in the off street car parks	
Too many parking restrictions already that put locals and visitors off	1
shopping in or coming to town	
Turning the small number of free waiting areas into paid bays will prevent	1
people from picking up and dropping off those with limited mobility	
Use the money to put on a bus that circles Tavistock, going to all the main	1
estates and car parks.	
Visitors are already well catered for by the large Riverside car park so why	1
not increase the fares for a 2 hour stay there instead?	
Wasting public money on investments in equipment that benefits the	1
parking meter suppliers and their shareholders.	
WDBC has offered enforcement in Tavistock as they think it can be carried	1
out more efficiently and more often	
We need residents permit parking in town as shoppers and town workers	1
fill the residents' streets	
We travel to Tavistock several times a week and rely heavily on the free	1
road parking that is available whilst my children do various sports clubs	
and activities.	
What's wrong with continuing to use traffic wardens?	1
When the scheme is set up, how long is it before the costs are met and	1
where is the money coming from?	
Why should the residents of West Street have to pay and display outside	1
their own properties.	
Why should we not have some free parking areas within the town?	1
Will affect carers who only have limited time to pop out.	1
Will make it more difficult to visit or family that live there.	1
Will the free first hour parking sooner or later be replaced with a charge?	1
Will this scheme be cashless, via an app?	1
With society becoming more and more cashless finding change for a meter	1
will deter some drivers.	
You currently pay for Traffic Wardens so that wouldn't change.	1

Comment	Count
You have still failed to bring in a train line after years of banging on about	1
it.	

Appendix 5 to CET/24/xx – Summary of Comments Received from Dartmouth Against Metered Parking (DAMP) Petition

Comment	Count
Opposes the proposals	2247
Supports the proposals	1
Respondent feels that pay and display restrictions will have a negative	342
impact on businesses in the town centre	J42
Respondent feels that the pay and display will discourage people from	303
visiting the town	303
The respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact parking for	192
locals	102
The proposals will kill off the town and trade	169
Respondent would like the parking to remain as it is now	101
Parking meters are detrimental to the look of the town	63
This is just a money making scheme	58
Respondent questions where will the workers park	55
The proposals will penalise locals who already struggle with the cost	43
of living	.0
The proposals will negatively impact tourism.	39
Shops are already struggling	31
Respondent will visit the town less if pay and display is implemented	25
Respondent comments that this scheme will not benefit the local	23
community	20
Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary	21
Respondent feels there are not enough parking facilities available for	21
workers that work in town	
Respondent feels there is not enough free parking as it is	21
I do not want to pay for parking	20
Charges would put additional financial strain on workers	19
respondent feels this is a further tax on motorists	18
Respondent feels the proposals will negatively impact people that	16
work and park in town	
We already pay council tax	16
Charges will be detrimental to the community	15
Respondent feels parking is currently too expensive	15
Free parking encourages locals and visitors into the town	14
Respondent suggests parking should be free for locals	14
Will impact residents who do not have off-street parking	14
I cannot afford to pay for parking	13
Proposals will deter people from coming into town, they will use	13
supermarkets instead	-
Respondent feels proposals will make life more difficult for the	13
residents	
Respondent suggests introducing residents parking permits	13
Existing public transport is poor, people have to use their cars	11
None of the revenues raised will go to Dartmouth.	11

Comment	Count
Respondent comments that the proposals are not wanted/ not	11
required	
Respondent feels there will be increased parking in residential areas	10
where spaces are already limited	
Will make it more difficult to visit or family that live there.	10
Respondent feels the proposed parking charges are too high	9
It will make shopping and working in Dartmouth more expensive.	8
Respondent feels that the town is already dying	8
Parking will be made worse not better	7
The town is too small and it would cause even more problems.	7
Charges would put additional financial strain on the citizens	6
Having to pay for parking will make me less likely to want to go into	6
town	
Respondent does not agree with statement of reasons	6
Respondent feels that it isn't fair to charge people extra on top of the	6
high cost of living in the area	
Respondent questions where will the residents park?	6
Elderly people will just not come into the town if these changes are	5
implemented	
Low income families are really going to struggle with the new	5
proposed changes to parking.	
Meters will damage the accessibility of the pavements that are already	5
narrow	
respondent feels a park and ride would be more beneficial	5
Short free parking allows locals & visitors a chance to pop into the	5
town & shop local	
Park and ride that runs all year round would be advantage	4
Respondent requests all day parking for residents and workers of the	4
town	
Access to town shops will be limited and costly to elderly population	3
feels this will lead to social isolation	3
It is a regency town, it will spoil it.	3
More vehicles driving around searching for spaces will increase	3
emissions.	
Need space in Dartmouth for people who work here all year.	3
Parking charges will affect the short term shoppers	3
Respondent comments that local residents are unlikely to pay for	3
parking in their own town	
Respondent comments that parking is already difficult in the town	3
Respondent is a business owner and feels that the proposals will	3
negatively affect their business as well as other businesses	
Respondent suggests keeping the current winter restrictions, charge	3
for parking during the summer	
Respondent will not come to Dartmouth again if this happens.	3
The proposals will encourage people to shop online	3
There is not enough residents parking in Dartmouth	3
Allow workers to park easily in the winter.	2

Comment Current parking has made the respondent avoid the town 2 Doubling the parking period will reduce the turnover of vehicles and availability of parking How much is this costing? 2 I am a Pensioner having to pay would impact a lot on my finances. 2 I do not support the proposed parking charges If proposals are introduced in Dartmouth, parking in Kingswear will soar out of control and it is already bad. If public transport services were improved, this scheme would be viable. Installing parking meters is a deterrent, not an enticement 2 It is a waste of public money 2 It is not clear how any money raised will benefit the town or its shoppers and businesses. It will destroy Dartmouth in the winter. 2 It will totally disrupt the parking flow movement making it more difficult for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter months Money should be spent on other services 2 Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months 2 Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current
Doubling the parking period will reduce the turnover of vehicles and availability of parking How much is this costing? I am a Pensioner having to pay would impact a lot on my finances. I do not support the proposed parking charges If proposals are introduced in Dartmouth, parking in Kingswear will soar out of control and it is already bad. If public transport services were improved, this scheme would be viable. Installing parking meters is a deterrent, not an enticement It is a waste of public money It is not clear how any money raised will benefit the town or its shoppers and businesses. It will destroy Dartmouth in the winter. It will totally disrupt the parking flow movement making it more difficult for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter months Money should be spent on other services Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
How much is this costing? I am a Pensioner having to pay would impact a lot on my finances. I do not support the proposed parking charges If proposals are introduced in Dartmouth, parking in Kingswear will soar out of control and it is already bad. If public transport services were improved, this scheme would be viable. Installing parking meters is a deterrent, not an enticement It is a waste of public money It is not clear how any money raised will benefit the town or its shoppers and businesses. It will destroy Dartmouth in the winter. It will totally disrupt the parking flow movement making it more difficult for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter months Money should be spent on other services Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
I am a Pensioner having to pay would impact a lot on my finances. I do not support the proposed parking charges If proposals are introduced in Dartmouth, parking in Kingswear will soar out of control and it is already bad. If public transport services were improved, this scheme would be viable. Installing parking meters is a deterrent, not an enticement It is a waste of public money It is not clear how any money raised will benefit the town or its shoppers and businesses. It will destroy Dartmouth in the winter. It will totally disrupt the parking flow movement making it more difficult for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter months Money should be spent on other services Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
If proposals are introduced in Dartmouth, parking in Kingswear will soar out of control and it is already bad. If public transport services were improved, this scheme would be viable. Installing parking meters is a deterrent, not an enticement 2 It is a waste of public money 2 It is not clear how any money raised will benefit the town or its shoppers and businesses. It will destroy Dartmouth in the winter. 2 It will totally disrupt the parking flow movement making it more difficult for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter 2 months
soar out of control and it is already bad. If public transport services were improved, this scheme would be viable. Installing parking meters is a deterrent, not an enticement 2 It is a waste of public money 2 It is not clear how any money raised will benefit the town or its 2 shoppers and businesses. It will destroy Dartmouth in the winter. 2 It will totally disrupt the parking flow movement making it more difficult 2 for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter 2 months Money should be spent on other services 2 Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months 2 Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. 2 Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
Viable. Installing parking meters is a deterrent, not an enticement It is a waste of public money It is not clear how any money raised will benefit the town or its shoppers and businesses. It will destroy Dartmouth in the winter. It will totally disrupt the parking flow movement making it more difficult for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter months Money should be spent on other services Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
It is a waste of public money It is not clear how any money raised will benefit the town or its shoppers and businesses. It will destroy Dartmouth in the winter. It will totally disrupt the parking flow movement making it more difficult for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter months Money should be spent on other services Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
It is not clear how any money raised will benefit the town or its shoppers and businesses. It will destroy Dartmouth in the winter. It will totally disrupt the parking flow movement making it more difficult for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter months Money should be spent on other services Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
shoppers and businesses. It will destroy Dartmouth in the winter. 2 It will totally disrupt the parking flow movement making it more difficult for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter months Money should be spent on other services Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
It will totally disrupt the parking flow movement making it more difficult for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter months Money should be spent on other services Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
for the flow of traffic. Leave the parking as it is, but remove the free parking in the winter months Money should be spent on other services Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
months 2 Money should be spent on other services 2 Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. 2 Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours 2 Provide free parking in the winter months 2 Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. 2 Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues 2
Nowhere in the proposal is there any consideration or scheme for the parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months 2 Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. 2 Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
parking requirements of the residents of affected roads. Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months 2 Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. 2 Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
Proposed changes do not take into account a stay in excess of 2 hours Provide free parking in the winter months Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
Raise the Council tax - not the cost of parking. Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact residents with mobility issues
Respondent comments that the changes will negatively impact 2 residents with mobility issues
residents with mobility issues
Respondent comments that the proposals will not improve the current 2
situation and will only make things worse
Respondent does not have a parking space so have the need for onstreet parking
Respondent feels people will choose to shop out of town where 2 parking is free
Respondent feels that they are having meters inflicted upon them 2
Respondent feels there is a shortage of parking spaces available and this needs addressing before implementing pay and display
Respondent feels this appears to be a further residents and visitors 2 tax
Respondent says there is no financial benefit for the town commerce or residences
Respondent states that if they have to pay to park, they will go to supermarkets 2
Ridiculous idea, spending money disrupting pavements for something 2 not needed or wanted
The max stay should remain at 2 hours 2

Comment	Count
The respondent feels the proposals will force people to park	2
inappropriately elsewhere	
this will reduce short term parking	2
Too many parking restrictions already that put locals and visitors off	2
shopping in or coming to town	
A paid for 2 hr will surely cost more than the potential returns and inhibit visits.	1
	1
As a second homeowner I would sell up, as pay and display would be too restrictive.	ı
As administrator am aware that crew called for training twice weekly	1
would have to pay for parking. Due to nature of training could cause	·
overrun of parking payment.	
At times the main car parks are full, even in winter. In the summer	1
tourists park here and car parks are often full	
Cashless payments discriminate against people who do not have	1
access to smart phones	
Conservation areas should not have street furniture	1
Council has not provided any justifiable reason for these unnecessary	1
proposals.	4
Currently issue with vehicles long-term parking 2 weeks at a time in	1
Mount Boone Way - introduced residents/time limited parking here and Mount Boone.	
Expiry reminders and SMS confirm are additional "hidden" charges.	1
Free parking along the sea front is good for locals and encourages	<u>'</u> 1
tourists.	·
Has any consideration been given to tradesmen and their livelihood, if	1
these proposals are implemented?	
Holidaying second home owners create more emissions when running	1
to and from their rural escapes than locals do on a day to day basis	
Hotels rely on the free parking for guests to park near the seafront	1
hotels.	
If Council wants businesses to survive they should provide more long-	1
term free parking.	1
If machines are installed they need to accept credit cards and cash and not to be solely accessible via a mobile phone app.	1
Improve coastal bus service.	1
It's about time the powers that be listen to the residents/town's people	1
what they want /need as it's them that matter not decisions made by	•
outsiders.	
Levelling up Secretary (April 2023] has told Councils they must not	1
force drivers to use Smart phone to pay for parking spaces as it	
disproportionately excludes elderly and vulnerable.	
Locals will be using the parking spaces more than visitors to the town	1
Meters will block pavements and make it harder for the pedestrians,	1
disabled and people with mobility issues	
No consideration of disabled drivers.	1

Comment	Count
Paid for parking will have to be used mostly by people that need	1
access to home/work and shops.	·
Please put alternative parking options in place before you restrict what	1
is currently available.	
Proposals are a barrier to accessibility	1
Respondent asks if there are any proposals relating to the cost of	1
annual permits, included in this proposal due to the reduction of	
available parking spaces	
Respondent comments that Dartmouth does not have a Train station,	1
therefore visitors have to drive or get the bus	
Respondent comments that elderly residents depend on this parking	1
area because of their mobility	
Respondent comments that free parking boosts the local economy	1
during the low season	
Respondent comments that introducing pay and display will make it	1
more difficult to access shops in the area	
Respondent comments that Mayors Avenue car park is not large	1
enough, especially as so many spaces are use up by holiday let	
permits, also the RingGo app does not allow you to renew your ticket	
for the next day.	
Respondent comments that parking meters will reduce the experience	1
of visiting the town centre	
Respondent comments that pay and display will make it too expensive	1
to visit the town on a daily basis	
Respondent comments that residents rely on free parking during the	1
low season to enable family members to visit. Elderly residents also	
depend on family visits for support	
Respondent comments that SHDC have introduced low season	1
charges at the park and ride, however there is no bus service to town,	
therefore parking options for visitors are extremely limited	4
Respondent comments that the changes will be detrimental to the	1
majority of the elderly population of the community	4
Respondent comments that the existing 2 hour spaces already	1
encourage traffic flow	1
Respondent comments that the money collected is unlikely to offset the cost of installation and maintenance	ı
Respondent comments that the proposals will negatively impact	1
people who live and work in the town	1
Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to shops	1
and public buildings	1
Respondent comments that the proposals will reduce access to their	1
premises	•
Respondent comments that this proposal is unnecessary and makes	1
no sense. It's not what the residents of the area want.	•
Respondent does not feel properly consulted.	1
Respondent feels 1 hour of free parking is not enough	1
Respondent feels DCC's proposals lack clarity	1
1 1 1	-

Comment	Count
Respondent feels parking charges are already too high.	1
Respondent feels that Pay & Display will push people away from the	1
town centre, particularly elderly and vulnerable people.	
Respondent feels that the proposals will affect access for the elderly	1
and disabled, as it will take them longer to carry out their business	
than the suggested free parking times	
Respondent feels that there are already pay and display car parks	1
nearby which can be used for longer visits.	
Respondent feels there will be payment problems for elderly people	1
who don't use payment apps or smart phones	
Respondent refuses to pay for this as a tax payer	1
Respondent reports that there is not much available off-street parking	1
in the town centre	
Respondent requests free parking permits for residents	1
Respondent says the proposals will negatively affect people that	1
volunteer in town and rely on free parking	
Respondent says this directive is counterintuitive to a thriving	1
community	
Respondent states the proposals will make it harder for people to	1
shop local	
Respondent suggests adding more free parking to boost the local	1
economy.	
Respondent suggests charging 2nd home owners higher council tax	1
rates to increase revenue	
Respondent suggests creating a car free zone	1
Respondent suggests creating more disabled bays	1
Respondent suggests implementing existing summer restrictions all	1
year round	
Respondent suggests improving the car parks	1
Respondent suggests raising money by re-introducing rates for	1
holiday homes and Airbnb	
Respondent suggests retaining the free parking during the winter	1
around Coronation Park	
Respondent understands there is a need for revenue, but this is a	1
false economy as business rates will drop when the shops shut up for	
good.	
Respondent works in town and feels they won't be able to use on	1
street parking to park for work anymore	
Restrictions on The Embankment should stay seasonal	1
Ridiculous proposals that only benefits tourism which already makes	1
daily life more stressful.	
Should be a limit on how many season permits are issued for Mayors	1
Avenue Car Park so that more paid parking is accessible in the car	
park.	
Signs should be up for motor homes "no overnight parking" and limit	1
to 2 hours.	
Some vehicles are left for 5 months in the winter - too much abuse!	1

Comment	Count
The free parking enables many people, especially the elderly who may	1
otherwise avoid visiting the town, access the shops without them	
having to walk too far.	
The hassle to download apps to pay will likely drive visitors away.	1
The proposals don't create more spaces	1
The proposals will increase congestion	1
The proposals will not improve congestion	1
The respondent questions the reasons why this proposal is being	1
Introduced The respondent requests a year round Park & Pide convice for	1
The respondent requests a year round Park & Ride service for Dartmouth	1
The town is in an AONB and the sea front makes a significant	1
contribution to that.	
The town looks appalling with weeds everywhere.	1
There are no parking charges in neighbouring out of town shopping	1
complexes so why introduce them into the town centre.	
There is no evidence supporting the claim that it will improve air quality.	1
There's not sufficient long stay pay and display spaces	1
These proposals are a waste of money	1
This will make parking worse in Dartmouth and force more	1
residents/workers to park in already overfilled Mayors Car Park	
This would penalise local people from parking in the town and pushing	1
them to park in the off street car parks	
What problem is trying to be solved by metering spaces that currently	1
are not?	
Why not use cardboard clock faces to display in cars to show length of	1
time parked - drivers need to purchase these.	
Will affect carers who only have limited time to pop out.	1
Will now have to pay to provide care to vulnerable patients who	1
require home visits	
Winter parking permits for residents for longer than 2 hours.	1