

**APPENDIX 2**

## Consultation Responses (Full)



I am objecting to point number 10 with regards to Mudge Way North and Ridgeway. Maintain a concessionary free period of parking within the following District car parks managed by a free vend parking ticket: Alexandra Rd, Broadway, Church St, Deans Cross, Devils Point, Haye Rd South, Marlborough St, Morice St, Mudge Way North, Ridgeway and West Park.

There are no issues with the parking at either of these 2 locations and to introduce a concessionary free period will just kill off the local businesses.

2 or 3 hours parking will still not be enough, so I would prefer you just leave it free as it is with no limit.

I frequently meet up with friends to go to lunch, have a coffee and then do a food shop on completion and by introducing this will be detrimental to the local business that operate on the Ridgeway as we will now have a restricted time limit to adhere to.

Also, I hear of a lot of people who like to drive to the Ridgeway, normally on a Friday or Saturday after the shops have closed, park their car overnight so that they can enjoy an evening visiting the local bars/ restaurants and return the following morning to collect it. I fear that by introducing a time limit, this will also increase the risk of people driving under the influence of alcohol as they will not be able to leave their car and may make the stupid decision to drive home instead.

In my opinion, I believe that it is clear that PCC have overspent and are not spending Council Tax wisely and as a result, are now going after drivers and road users to try and recover money in the form of parking fines and increased fares instead of thinking logically.

I realise the Council needs more revenue but I do wonder at some of your proposals.

For a start I see no relevance in the cost of parking in other cities to the situation in Plymouth.

I understand the need for increased charges but you do not say what you will charge in the 3 bands for off street parking. I hope the increase will be very modest. I don't know how many millions of pounds are being spent on revamping the city centre, presumably to make it more attractive and so increase footfall. There is also a need to make things easier for retail businesses and big increases in parking charges are likely to deter visits to the city rather than increase them.

I do not understand how making on street meters cashless is offering more choice to people. It may have missed your notice that some people do not have smart phones. Even for those who have, sometimes they are out of juice or even forgotten at home. I have a smart phone but at my age I still much prefer paying by cash. I hope you will reconsider that proposal.

I applaud the decision to reduce the free time for parking in Mutley and also to limit it at Devil's Point. Free parking is a splendid idea but it often has unintended consequences

As you stated in your comments, the changes are about increasing the prices! That's true

I hope that all machines will have a contactless option (the phone app isn't the best most of the time and includes additional fees!). Personally, I prefer a barrier car park as I do not have anxiety to finish by certain time! I feel as a prisoner when parking in a pay and display parking area!

Finally,

Your comments about reducing the carbon print is very misleading. Car owners will continue to use their car even with the price increase. If you want to decrease carbon print, you could increase EV charging points, reduce tariffs on EV parking or similar actions. You have done no additional measures of that!

I am writing to lodge my objections to the proposed parking plans for Plympton.

With the economy the way it is retail and hospitality are struggling as it is, to introduce a parking charge (even if you offer a 2-3 hour free period) will have a massive impact on the ridgeway and its trade.

hair appointments take far longer than this, a lunch with friends would be out but most importantly and something that seems to have not been considered is the amount of people who attend either the pubs or conservative club with leave their cars so they are not drink driving , your plan will have a seriously dangerous sting in the tail as these people could then make the choice to drive home, as there are never any police around as they are so short staffed this means more drink drivers on the roads !

Please reconsider the huge effects this will have on Plympton as its disaster waiting to happen sadly.

Also why is Dan Collins allowed a voice on this when he is no longer a voice for his constituents!

I am writing to provide some feedback on the recent proposals surrounding changes to parking fees in Plymouth.

I would like to start by saying I totally agree with the majority of the proposals. During this climate emergency we should be doing everything we can to encourage people to stop using private vehicles. I also am aware of how austerity has put a massive strain on local authorities and understand how increased revenues could benefit the city and its inhabitants.

I do however wish to raise one issue that I oppose. This is the increase in resident's permits from £30 to £41. The proposal outlines that the £11 rise is in line with inflation, which is currently at 11%. If this were true, surely the permits should rise by 11% which is £3.30, bringing the total to £33.30? I require a car to access my place of work, with the recent dramatic increase in the cost of living, I am finding it really hard to make ends meet. Changes like this, which are significantly above inflation, will have a negative impact. I feel like they are punishing those who have no choice but to pay up. Please could you offer an explanation as to why the increase is so drastically above inflation?

I do hope that those employed by PCC are receiving pay increases in line with inflation as per this policy?

I would appreciate it if you were to take my comments on board during the consultation, and provide me with some feedback regarding the issues raised.

Various residents of College Avenue, listed at the bottom of this letter, have come together as a community to provide the following comments in relation to the parking proposals for the city.

As residents of College Avenue we are struggling daily with parking issues along our street. I believe many of the residential streets off of Mutley high street are in a similar predicament. All being in Zone U, which is one of the only zones in the city that has a 2 hour resident's only allocation, rather than the standard 3.

Around 90% of the vehicles parked along the street belong to employees of businesses along the high street, mainly estate agents in our street. As I mentioned, there is only a requirement of a permit between the hours of 0800 and 1000, so outside of those hours it's a free parking ground for anyone who wishes to use it. Residents are expected to pay for an annual permit for 2 hours parking a day, which for any working person leaving the house between 0800-0900 in the morning, we are in essence paying to be able to park our car there for 30 mins a day and 2 hours on a Saturday morning. We are coming home from work and there are no spaces along the street. Come 1800 the street is empty as businesses along the high street have closed and employees have gone home.

The increase in cost to the residents permit for us seems unacceptable, without a change to the residents permit allocation within the zone. It would be better for us to move our cars to Mutley Barracks or Napier Street car parks for the 2 hours free parking, rather than pay for an annual

residents permit, although completely inconvenient and leaving less spaces for visitors to our local high street.

Speaking with various residents, businesses and witnessing it for myself, the reduction of free hours in Mutley Barracks and Napier Street car parks will be a positive change and is fully supported. It will stop people utilising these car parks when not visiting the high street, leaving important and much needed space for visitors using the local shops and facilities. It will indeed see a very small number of visitors utilising these car parks, rather than our street. However, it will not deter employees of businesses. Why would they want to pay £5 a day to park when they can park in College Avenue from 1000 for free? The increase in costs to business permits won't deter them either. Business permits provide the user the ability to park in a resident's only area for 2 hours. With College Avenue only having a 2 hour restriction, that means they can park here all day.

Mutley high street is a local high street servicing local residents. There isn't much to keep visitors along the high street for longer than a couple of hours. The car parks provide ample parking and the public transport links, that the council urge people to utilise, are all sufficient for visitors to access and make use of Mutley. Why then do residents have to suffer these parking issues? Why are there such minimal hours applied to the residents permits in these areas?

I appreciate this letter is very much focused on our street/zone and the parking proposals outline many areas within the city. There have been many attempts in speaking to local councillors and parking managers from the residents individually, with no success. However, I believe our comments on the increase in resident's permits and Mutley Barracks and Napier Street car parks are relevant to this proposal.

I do not agree with proposals to raise car parking charges or resident permit charges in this time of rising inflation and high prices on essentials such as food, petrol and gas/electricity. People can't afford it as it is with more inflation forecast to come.

Raising the cost of parking especially in places like town or the Hoe will have a knock on effect of less visitors and therefore less trade for businesses, cafes etc. and so is a backward step when we are trying to regenerate interest and footfall in these areas. With so many businesses and shops closing already in town, it's starting to look like a rundown ghost town. If you raise car parking charges, more people will stop using these areas as they won't be able to afford it.

Also, you have made many car parks cashless, many people without smart phones cannot download parking apps and prefer to use cash, and you have totally ignored this fact meaning people won't go to these places if they can't afford to pay the higher charges or can't have the option to use cash. Very disappointed with your proposals, poor Plymouth is going backwards, when we need to go forwards.

I have some questions regarding the increase cost of the installation of disabled parking markings from £40 to £150.

1. Why is there such a dramatic increase, nearly 400%
2. As the disabled parking bays are polite notices, where anyone can park, this is unfair to have such a hefty cost. They do not come under any enforcement and disabled people cannot always use them.

I would appreciate a reply

Whilst I agree with most of the changes proposed to the parking arrangements in the city, I do not think that in the current economic climate it is the right time to increase parking fees & resident parking fees. If the city is deemed to be too expensive to park in, it will drive people away from the city centre to out of town shopping areas which will be completely counter-productive.

I have just got through the 68 pages of the very wordy and unreadable document, I am in disagreement with the of the Parking Modernisation its timing is idiotic.

I feel that at this critical time with the increase in daily living expenses, and fuel costs along with massive utility increases, and now Plymouth Council looking at increasing parking charges, around the City, just because you have not increased parking for some year's doesn't mean that you

should, cut down on the rubbish statues, use local artists like the beautiful bird at Central Park, and dragon fly in the City Centre.

There are already masses of empty shops in the City Centre, you are forcing people to head out of the Town Centre to get all their shopping, hence killing off what was once a vibrant place, to a ghost town.

The Residents parking permit increases is far too high as an £11 increase, people in certain areas i.e. close to Devonport Dockyard or the city centre where high work force took over residents parking, had to request parking permit's in order to access and park close to their property.

The council has benefited financially from this and have racked in thousands of pounds, therefore a small increase of fees of £5.00 is much more appropriate, some families will even find that a struggle.

I oppose this Parking Modernisation.

Once again the subject of parking within Ridgeway car parks occurs.

Now in 2022 my business has been running for fifty years and although many others have come and gone I speak with some knowledge of the area!

More than fifty percent of the workers in this shopping district do not live within PL7 and unlike the city centre they are unable to bus to Plympton from other areas of the city. To change the available parking to a two hour limit would cause those workers to seek parking within the side roads and residential areas.

The businesses within Ridgeway offering services taking more than two hours would most definitely struggle to maintain a clientele within a two hour limit.

What we have at the moment works and a change would definitely discourage clients from using our struggling high street.

The cost of imposing a two hour limit and the prospect of parking permits for the residential side roads would be very unpopular and expensive.

What we have within Plympton at the moment is successful and should stay the same.

Council needs to reconsider the economic implications to struggling high streets!

I understand from my local councillor there are plans to introduce parking charges at The Ridgeway Plympton / other Plympton council car parks which are currently free to park in for customers supporting local businesses. Can I register my objection and disappointment with regards these proposals as this will deter people from supporting local business if they have to pay to park attracting them to other retailers within Plympton where parking is free or, forcing people to park in residential areas and then walking to the Ridgeway to shop causing a nuisance to residents.

A few observations on the proposals:

1. I can't see any mention of Residents' Visitors passes – of which we are allowed 14 per fortnight @ £2 each
2. The proposal to go cash-less clearly SAVES THE Council a lot of ,money, but what about the minority of (mainly elderly) who have no mobile phone &, possibly, no credit card.
3. What will happen to the free carpark for the Cremyll Ferry – which seems to be mainly used by residents of Durnford Street?
4. I live in Plympton and prior to covid would visit Plymouth for shopping on a regular basis. With increases in Bus fares and these proposed increases in Car Parking, it is unlikely that I will be returning to the pre-covid regularity. You are simply pricing the centre out for shopping and directing shoppers online!

I can see the benefits and reasons behind many of these proposals, but I don't see putting up the price of residents permits as a necessary or even reasonable. It is bad enough that some people need to pay £30 a year to have the option of parking somewhere near their own house. (Often

not even outside their house or even being able to park at all.) It isn't like they have an alternative but to pay the fees. With the current climate this is an increase which could simply wait until things get settled and people can afford a moderate rise in this fee.

Also a second point on the resident permit increase. Increasing a £30 charge by £11 is around a 35% increase. The current rate of inflation in the UK is around 10% which would mean a £3 rise. Why are you suggesting such a huge increase and then saying it is in line with inflation when it is more than 3 times inflation?

Finally on resident's permits, what extra are residents going to get for this massive price increase? We rarely see any parking enforcement teams anymore and often cannot park due to people parking without permits. I have reported this on multiple occasions in the past via the online portal, ticking the box to request an update on the resultant fines but never heard anything. I can only assume that this just goes into a black hole so is a total waste of my time.

On the subject of visitor permits, surely these raise a good amount of money for the council without any real downside / costs. It allows residents to have visitors without them having to park a long way away. With elderly people in particular the lack of a visitors pass might mean that they no longer get the vital human contact they need to survive. I see no benefit in removing this option for people and it will reduce the money available to the council.

Feel it's wrong to increase parking charges in town when it is already like a ghost town , many more shops will close

I live in a parking permit area, where at present we pay £30 per year for our permit and £30 for a book of visitors permits, we are not guaranteed a space outside our houses, let alone in the street, I cannot see how you can justify an increase to £41, this is just revenue collection, we do not receive anything for paying for a permit. The streets are not repaired, the pavements are a mess, why should we be penalised just because we don't have off road parking.

No problem with potential price hikes - but please do not do away with cash payment option for us oldies...

With reference to the proposal regarding parking modernisation and, in particular, the District car parks. I would very strongly object to any charges being levied as it will have a detrimental effect on all the businesses in the local areas. The majority of these are still recovering from the effects of the pandemic and if parking charges are put in place this will encourage people to go to the large superstores where parking is free. In the present economic situation we should be encouraging everyone to support local businesses and any parking charges would discourage people from doing this.

The proposals that have been made are good.

The only one that concerns me is Resident Parking Permits increasing to £41. Approximately 80p per week to park near your home which is good.

However, the terms & conditions for applying for a Resident Parking Permit states that vehicles should be no more than 5.5 metres in length. As there are no bays marked a lot of cars take up more space than they need to.

So in order for another revenue stream for the council could residential streets be marked with bays and parking outside of the bays would result in a penalty notice.

This would also alleviate tensions with residents when shift workers return home at night time and cannot park near their homes as cars are taking up more than one space.

The increase in parking charges are ill-timed and the reasons given quite erroneous.

Quoting national averages is spurious as Plymouth does not have an 'average-aged population' nor the same wages structure as that in other cities.

Entering a period of high inflation and a potential recession, the only way to keep businesses afloat would be to reduce parking charges and make an attempt to keep the City Centre 'alive' rather than push more people into out-of-town facilities.

The loss in income from business rates would probably wipe out the increased revenue from the revised charges.

Basically the wrong proposal at the wrong time.

Dear Sir/Madam, I write to you in response to your proposals to remove the Annual Visitor Permits and replace them with Daily Resident Visitor Tickets in Crownhill. I find this proposal outrageous on two counts: 1. COST. We currently pay £15 for our annual Resident Visitor Permit. This would rise to £100 as we would require 3 books of 30 tickets. How can such a massive increase of 566% be justified at any time but particularly now in the current climate of escalating living costs? You state in the 'Parking Modernisation and Environment Plan' (PMAEP) 1.3, Council's Values, that you will 'champion fairness' but these proposals are clearly not fair with such a huge cost increase to residents of Crownhill. You also state in the PMAEP, 2. Background, 2.2, that there hasn't been a rise in residents' permits for 14 years. That doesn't mean that now you can make up for missed opportunities and increase the cost by such a massive jump. Surely, a small annual increase would have been the way to manage matters? Similarly, in PMAEP, 3. Current Position, Residents Parking, 3.6, you state that there's not been an increase for 15 years. A similar argument applies here as in the paragraph above. 2. PRACTICALITY AND CONVENIENCE. Your proposal to remove Annual Visitor Permits and replace them with Daily Resident Visitor Tickets means that the maximum number of visits that we can have from family and friends, where they can park close to our house, is just 90 a year. I find this stance dictatorial and completely unworkable. Take for example our daughter who visits us regularly with our 2 small grandchildren. On average, we see them about 4 times a week. 52 weeks of the year multiplied by 4 is 208. That takes us well over the allowed maximum number of visits. It is unreasonable, to say the least, that you expect our daughter, with her two young children (aged 11 months and 3 years) to park away from our house with all the paraphernalia that comes with young children. In addition to this, there's the safety aspect to consider whereby if our daughter cannot park outside our house she'll have to cross several busy roads with 2 very small children. To me, that's completely unacceptable and unnecessary. On top of this, having gone well over the 90 visit threshold with our daughter's visits alone, nobody else can park near our house when visiting. Ludicrous! This will certainly mean that some of our family and friends, unable to park outside our house, will not be able to visit us because of age and health issues. Unacceptable. We also know of elderly residents living close by who do not qualify for an Essential Visitor Permit. Once their allowed 90 visits are exhausted what do they do? It is quite obvious that their mental and physical health will deteriorate once regular visitors decide not to visit because of the difficulty with parking. Having explained my 2 main objections to the proposal to withdraw Residents' Visitor Permits there are a number of other points to make: 1. I have found it very difficult to gain a hard copy of the proposals. This I consider to be essential as some of the connecting documents online do not have page numbers therefore are difficult to follow. Following the advice given on the notices attached to local lamp-posts I phoned the number given, only to hear that I would have to wait an hour to speak to someone. Clearly, that's not practical. I then decided to call-in to Ballard House to see if someone could assist me. The gentleman at reception (Len?) was very helpful and I left my contact details with him so that he could investigate my request for a hard copy of the document. Within the hour I had a call from Len giving me a number to call. I phoned the number, spoke to a lady who said she could post me a hard copy. To date, I am still waiting to receive anything from her. As it happens, Councillor James Stoneman was able, after some delay, to obtain 2 hard copies of the documents I required. I am grateful for his assistance. I would have thought that it would have been a lot easier to obtain hard copies of important Council documents, particularly when there are important matters involved. 2. It is mentioned about the need to be consistent across the city but one size does not fit all. Our particular difficulties and issues in Crownhill will be different from other areas of the city. In conclusion, I understand that the Council is under huge financial stress at the moment. The job of organising the budget and providing the services that we all demand, must be very difficult. That said, the proposals by the Council to change the permit arrangements in Crownhill, as they stand, are totally unacceptable to our community. I urge the Council to reconsider their proposals for Crownhill.

I am a resident living in Lipton, there are a few points that I would like to make regarding your new proposals regards parking.

Is it now the right time to force people to pay more for parking in Plymouth, as the cost of living is going up so much, surely this will drive people away from the centre of Plymouth, retailers are struggling now with costs and this will only make things worse.

The idea for people to pay by phone or card and not cash is ok but will there be a provision for people that don't have a mobile and in some cases a bank card to pay by cash?

You mention about Residents parking going up in line with inflation, inflation is now about ten percent and yet the increase you propose is way above this figure, WHY? I live in an area of residents parking and it is nye on impossible to park after 4pm on any day and not at all at weekends. I have asked that there should be a longer restriction on the length of time someone without a permit can park. We pay for a service we don't really get and it is not really fare In conclusion, you seem intent on running down the footfall in Plymouth city centre and driving people to go elsewhere for their shopping, you are forcing people to pay more when most have less to spend.

Why are you trying to make Plymouth a worse place to live, surely you should be promoting it not trying to destroy it with swinging price rises

Having read the proposals to increase the permit charges by 36% , which I consider rather excessive, whilst I understand the need to increase all fees due to the financial predicament we are all suffering, I would like you to consider the following, I live in the BB parking zone, our area has residents parking times from 0900 to 1200 then 1800 to 2100, we have problems with non-residents parking for the six hours between permit hours that is detrimental to shift workers/ teachers/anyone with medical appointments, I have witnessed on many occasions non-residents parking then going into town on foot or by bus then returning 3-4 hrs later with shopping, therefore depriving the council of much needed parking revenue , also in this area of the BB zone we have a lot of industrial units who also use it as a free parking space ,I therefore suggest perhaps change the permit hours to operate from 0900 to 2100.

I think your plans are completely out of touch and line with what the people of the city of Plymouth need at this moment in Time.

So removing cash payments is going to limit the options for paying to park, also any increase will make town just a place people will not visit I myself used to live in the city centre the parking charges are killing the city centre off. I have recently moved to Southway there are shops outside of the city centre that sell goods I used to buy in town the difference is free accessible parking. Putting charges up taking away methods of paying is just going to make people more put off.

What Plymouth needs is Greater investment in infrastructure invest in the public transport companies the car parks should have a parking scheme where people are put first in a time of a living crisis city centre parking should be free to encourage people to buy local and shop in the city centre I fear your just going to kill the city centre off by hiking up more of a charge I wonder how many businesses you have asked about parking charges and whether they agree with it.

I'm concerned because not only at the moment does the city centre look a state with the works going on what is there that actually can draw shoppers into Plymouth honestly ???

Someone needs to shake their heads and look at the bigger picture

I write with my comment on the proposals to increase charges for street parking in Plymouth, as follows:-

- I. It seems illogical to increase the charges on all those who have no alternative to parking on the street in Plymouth, just because Plymouth's charges are below others. Parking charges should be assessed according to what is needed for Plymouth residents. To increase parking charges in the middle of a cost-of-living crisis is harsh, and not in the interests of the majority of residents who have to park on the street.

2. It is discriminatory to increase charges for the majority of the street parking car-owners in Plymouth when a segment in Durnford Street and Cremyll Street enjoy the privilege of long-term free parking at the Cremyll Ferry "Visitors" car park. I have previously corresponded with your department about the inability of visitors to find a space for the ferry, because the carpark is nearly always full of long-term parked vehicles. Plymouth Council should not be increasing the charges for the majority, when a small minority living in or near these streets enjoy free parking. It creates the suspicion that there may be some self-interest at work here.

Parking fees should be reduced not increased.

I particularly oppose the increase in business permits £400 per vehicle (from £300!) That is an increase of 33%, how is that in line with inflation or any other measure? You aren't even justifying it. That is too expensive for most businesses operating in Plymouth!

With regards to the parking consultation, I would like to see more (and clearly marked) motorbike/scooter parking as well as clearly defined (and securable) cycle parking in and around the city centre.

Plymouth already has a good reputation as being a motorcycle-friendly city with many small free parking bays for bikers and this should be praised and encouraged. It benefits from the annual Megaride and last year hosted the Tour of Britain cycling stage, so I feel this should be encouraged with more provision for both kinds of two-wheel users.

I'd like to reply to the proposed parking charge changes

I don't have a choice but to drive and park in the city centre as I work there and due to my shift times the public transport system just won't work for me.

The bus I would have to catch to get me to work on time for an early shift would see me arrive approx. 90 minutes before my shift starts, and there isn't a bus running when I finish on a late shift. To park out of the city centre would involve a long walk in and out on my own which again is not something I'm willing to do for my own safety! I'd happily take the bus if it ran at times I could get home on late shifts. This just isn't a possibility unfortunately so driving in is my only option.

I'm also interested to know the criteria for the so called discounted rates for NHS workers? As I am one and not aware that there are any currently!

This is an unnecessary increase at a time people are struggling. Which just goes to show how much our local council care about its people!

I'm a Chaddlewood resident and as I say on some shifts there are literally no buses I can catch to get home so have no choice but to park

These new charges are discriminating against the disabled and anyone who does not possess a smart phone or a contactless debit/credit card, of which there are many. Whilst you may see smart phones and contactless cards as being the best thing since sliced bread, there are an awful lot of people out there who disagree and these people will no longer be able to park in town. These people are afraid of technology, distrust it or simply believe it is unnecessary. Whilst these people remain in the minority, and you undoubtedly sneer at them for being backwards, it is unfair to punish them by removing cash parking machines.

Additionally, reducing parking times to 2 hours is extremely limiting for people with a disability who have to unload their scooter from their car, put it together before going into town, then get back in time to dismantle their scooter and get it back in their car. Two hours is simply not enough, it means very short forays into town, or not going out.

As for the £150 fee for a disabled parking space, apart from the fact that your application system is flawed and prevents people in need from acquiring one, this additional fee is extortionate and will prevent people applying. The only disabled people who can afford it are those in well paid employment and many people with disabilities are unable to work or are on low income. This

charge is excessive. £150 to be informed that because the person can walk 20 yards on the flat they can't have a disabled space outside their house sitting on a 1 in 10 hill is theft.

I appreciate that the council is £13m+ in the hole, but this is not the way to top up the council coffers, punishing those who are less fortunate or simply don't appreciate modern technology. This will ensure people don't go into town and do not apply for much needed disabled parking spaces outside of their homes. These charges will isolate already vulnerable people.

I believe the proposed changes will have no impact on the environment, and will not make the drivers experience any easier. It will provide Plymouth City Council with more money, which it probably needs, but why pretend it is done for any other reason?

If it were to help with the environment, the bus tickets would be lowered and busses routes would be expanded at the same time. A bus fare from Mount Gould to town and back is over £3. For a 10 minutes' drive. Robbery! Other parts of the country might have dearer parking, but they have a better public transport network.

Also, Plymouth city centre is dead, little to see and do. I believe these proposals will keep even more people away from it. I rather go to Plymstock where the parking is free and most shops are open.

It is a very short-sighted plan, done merely to raise money, and it will affect mainly low income families, the only ones still bothering visiting the failing city centre.

Not that my opinion will make any difference...

With reference to your proposed changes regarding parking and permits in the city in particular residential parking permits.

I have no objection to the proposed price increase to £41 however the parking restrictions within the zones needs updating.

I live in the PL4 8RL area, currently the only restriction is Mon to Fri 10am till 11am, so yeah I can always park between those times, however if I arrive home late afternoon/evening and especially a weekend I don't not stand a chance of parking close to my home which is very frustrating.

I strongly believe if you do go ahead with the proposed increase then permit holders get priority parking and the timing of the zones needs updating as its simply unfair to us that purchased permits

I would just like to make comment on the parking modernisation scheme.

On the whole I do believe that most of the changes are reasonable. However the one/ones I have concerns about are the removal of the cashless parking, from my experience with elderly parents not everyone has smart phones to be able to have the technology to be able to pay via the app and similarly with debit/credit card.

However my major concern is the dramatic price increase in the hourly parking rate for parking within the city. At a time when the city centre has a lot of empty spaces and shops are still trying to recoup from the last 2 years as well as an impending recession it feels like a time when we want to keep people visiting the city not jumping the prices so as not to make it a place to avoid and make it easier to place an internet order as this will certainly not benefit the city or local businesses. I understand the councils need to balance the budgets but wonder if a smaller increase such as 10 or 15p an hour increase could make a difference that would increase revenue but would also be a selling point for the city to encourage people to visit as parking is cheaper than other areas. I hope you take these points into account

My use of the ridgeway and support of their trade will significantly reduce should I have to pay to park!

The proposals to raise the hourly parking charges in Plymouth by 33% to £2 per hour is absolutely outrageous. To state that this compares to the rest of the country is absolutely untrue unless you have been comparing to the areas around the capital. Having travelled around the

country I have found our hourly charges to be amongst the dearest around. In order to justify this increase details are required of the areas compared in order to justify this proposal.

Whilst it is understood the Council has a budgetary deficit, it is not acceptable to raise charges by 33%. This is just another case of the council wanting to do less for more money. No garden waste, increased parking charges, what next? The council does not seem to care about how families are going to cope in this cost of living crisis or the fact that people will now be dissuaded from visiting the city centre and thus the subsequent impact on the businesses that require the footfall.

This overall proposal is an absolute disgrace.

I am writing with my response to the above consultation

I strongly object to the proposed changes on the following grounds

1) changes to residents parking permits can only be undertaken in agreement with residents and to show that there is an increased cost to maintain the scheme

You have over the past 3 years applied virtual permits and automated application scheme to reduce the majority of your costs

You have not relied to my knowledge any scheme

Therefore I would request either through this or by freedom of information a detailed breakdown of the costs of providing a permit scheme and the income for all schemes including enforcement and the actual spend on Maintaining schemes currently in place over the past 3 years Secondly you have failed to publish a details parking report as required in law to show where you spend all monies taken through parking (2015 deregulation bill)

Thirdly why you have chosen to penalise residents at a time when we have increased bills already highlighted by national government

Fourthly please publish the benchmark data so that we can see what you are saying is true

The government have warned local authorities that they cannot reduce budgets to highways and then supplement through higher fees can you therefore evidence the funding for highways over the past three years and how the additional income to parking will be spent and how this is in addition to the pre-existing highway budget (Barnet and Dorset court case)

I met with the ward councillor for whittleigh at a residents meeting and he was not in support of the charges

Why is the city centre on street not included

Why has the focus been to penalise residents

I would ask if any elected councillors or senior officers truly understand the impact of the cost of living

As a business owner not only will my residents permit increase but also my business permit on top of business rate increases

Where is your evidence to show cashless is cheaper, please supply your evidence of actual current costs against any current costs

I look forward to hearing from you

As an older person who has just started living in Plymouth, I have found parking extremely confusing and irritating.

This summer I tried to park in the multi-storey car park at the station as I found, to my surprise, that here was no direct bus to the station. I parked the car and together with the help of another driver, I tried to pay on the app, ringing the number displayed and by credit card; all unsuccessful. This took 20 minutes at the end of which, I simply drove to Exeter!

The different systems in place mean that when I need to take the car, I tend to park in Drake's Circus, and walk everywhere from there. The instructions in the car park are clear, the payment machines are great and you pay as you leave.

Please bear in mind the campaign of Silver Voices and disability groups; there are many people who cannot use apps or mobile phones. Do not discriminate against them.

I am the Secretary of Plympton Bowling Club and am concerned if the Council bring a limit of 2 hours parking in all Car Parks. It will no doubt be the case that motorists will use the free parking

at a Plympton if they cannot use the regular place. Free parking in Plympton is supposed to be for leisure uses only tennis, cricket, swimming bowls library and events in Harewood Hse. Many of the sports last longer than 2 hrs. A game of bowls is a minimum of two and a half hours, plus preparing for match setting up green etc. Many of these matches will exceed 4 hours.

Surely the Council aren't expecting a mass exodus from the green to try a find another parking space or risk a fine???

Some solution has to be found, perhaps permits need to be considered which we have suggested before. Members would then display them on windscreens.

I sincerely hope sense prevails.

The hike in parking charges will kill off our City Centre. People will look elsewhere to shop, shops will shut and tax revenue reduced. Permit charges for residents in this time of huge financial crisis is not the way forward and will place further burden on residents.

I totally disagree with charges for district shopping centres. This will kill trade in Ridgeway Plympton which is the heart of the community. 2hr limited parking is no good for staff or those visiting hairdressers and beauty salons. People will stop enjoying our cafes and supporting restaurants in this area.

Whilst I have been told all the additional measures will cost very little and will be resourced I don't believe this. To increase patrols will cost more in staff time. To maintain machines will cost more and all of this when residents are already suffering due to finances and fuel crisis. I don't support these measures and if it's voted on I will oppose.

This is an example of the Conservative administration damaging business and placing huge pressures on residents.

I would like to register my concern about the possibility of parking meters being installed in the District shopping centre carparks around Plympton Ridgeway.

I believe that it is important to keep access as easy as possible in order to promote community activities and the businesses which we all know have been struggling post-Covid and with the current economic crisis.

I am concerned that although the proposal is currently for the parking to remain free, this could be a slippery slope towards charging in the future and drive away support for this popular District shopping centre.

I am also concerned that parking in the nearby residential roads will become overwhelmed if people choose not to register their car numbers and the car park nearest to Harewood House and the community which it supports, as well as the community sports of Tennis, Bowling and Cricket.

The District car parks also serve the Health and Wellbeing Hub at the Rees centre, and car park meters will affect this usage in my belief.

This proposal goes against the Plympton St Mary Neighbourhood Plan of which I was a part of formulating in:

PSM6 - Ridgeway shopping which reads 'Free and good parking facilities are key to the success of the established retail and employment areas of Plympton St Mary and something both residents and businesses wish to continue to support'

Community Action EC4 – 'To support proposals for the continuation and expansion of free, short and long term parking to meet the needs of local businesses'.

I hope you take my comments into account when making decisions which will impact on the community and residents I serve.

Plympton St. Mary Ward Councillors wish to record our opposition to the introduction of parking machines and ticketing arrangements in the Mudgeway North and Ridgeway car parks in Plympton.

We have received no requests from local businesses or residents for such expense to be incurred and such a proposal will inevitably lead to the introduction of car parking charges in future and the loss of trade to Ridgeway business.

The consequences of such a proposal will lead to additional parking in neighbouring residential streets and in the car parking provision at Harewood House and at the Plympton Swimming Pool causing significant inconvenience to residents and those using public facilities.

We recommend that the proposal is abandoned.

Please keep Cllrs Harrison, Darcy and myself informed of any future recommendations from this consultation.

I would like to be able to pay for my parking with cash and not be forced to use a card or phone app.

I write this in response to your planned proposal to alter the rules and regulations with regards to the parking in Cross Park Road/Way/Avenue.

I can totally get the intention to raise the residents parking BUT I do resent this charge being here in the first place!! I think it unlikely to change but I do want to note I think it unfair.

My real gripe however is the scrapping of the visitors parking scheme - and changing it to a capped system of 90 visits/visitors a year!!

The last 2+years we've been living in isolation and whilst I am fortunate enough to have a drive to accommodate visitors many of my neighbours do not!!

Many elderly people live in this area and are reliant on professional and altruistic visitors who offer physical, mental emotional and spiritual support and help this now is threatened and their anxiety levels have shot up!!

I am not from Plymouth and enjoy it when my family come to visit from around the country - am I now only allowed to see them at the councils pleasure rather than my own!

I'd strongly encourage you to reconsider your thinking in this matter

I object to your amendments to the parking in Plymouth. You will price people out of going in to town. People will shop online. The high street in Plymouth will collapse.

I suggest the council budget better. As all I'm seeing is cuts. No mow may which doesn't get sorted until July. No more black garden waste collection. Roads in poor condition. Make changes where changes need to be made. Not increasing the parking to help yourself whilst killing the business owners.

I object most strongly to the proposed plan to put parking charges in car parks, Plympton Iceland and Plymco car parks are used by a large proportion of the local residents, To impose charges here would be the death for a lot of the businesses who are already struggling; it would drive shoppers to the large supermarkets and out of town shops who have free parking.

Plympton and Plymstock residents already pay their fair share of PCCs income through their council Tax

I would strongly object to the removal of the ability to pay by cash.

1. The council would be open to legal challenge if a cash option was not available.
2. It discriminates against those without a smartphone or cash card, such as elderly.
3. Currently, it is not clear when your machines have taken payment in all cases, this can (and has) resulted in deducting double payments

Please tell me how the removal of the use of cash for parking meters reduces the cities carbon footprint?

I would be fascinated to know.

I wish to express my opposition to the removal of the payment by cash method for car parking. I believe that the cash method is still an important and convenient method for many people and a move to digital methods should not exclude these people.

The subject of cashless parking has been reported by many media outlets over the past few years. One such story was run by the Express newspaper on 31st May 2022 titled " motorists slam cashless parking as totally discriminatory ". Included in the article were the results of a poll which the newspaper ran between 26th > 30th May 2022. The Express asked the public "should car

parks still accept cash after elderly drivers fined". The result was an overwhelming 99% of the public who responded answered "yes" car parks should still accept cash. Perhaps a similar poll should be run for Plymouth residents before cashless methods are imposed.

Re: request for comments on parking modernisation

If you remove cash payments some will not be able to pay. Most elderly drivers do not have smartphones and wouldn't know what an 'app' was. So this would be discrimination against those without smartphones because you are removing their ability to pay and thus park.

Increasing parking charges will just do more damage to city centre shops. There are other towns where parking is much cheaper eg Saltash 70p per hour. So Plymouth is expensive already in comparison.

In response to the parking proposals:

Whilst I agree with the sentiment around climate change, it seems to me that all this will do is make an already financial hardship even worse for many in the city. I would wholeheartedly agree with parking increases (for the sake of our planet) if public transport infrastructure was efficient and a cheaper option, but it is not. It is currently cheaper for me to drive my car than it is to get a bus into town, or to get a train... if visiting outside the city. I want to support our planet by travelling by public transport but it is currently inefficient and too expensive for me. I have to drive to just outside the city centre and walk the rest of the way - even park and ride works out more expensive, by the time I also have to drive to Milehouse. Even with the increased parking charges it will still be cheaper for me to drive into town if I only need to pop in for one or two hours.

Please look at ways of reducing public transport costs and increasing its efficiency before increasing parking charges.

- Removing cash payments and modernising and upgrading all on-street systems to accept payments by phone (via Apple and Android Pay for example), credit and debit cards and mobile apps, offering greater choice and convenience for drivers and removing the need to use cash, which helps reduce the city's carbon footprint

I worry for people who can't use apps like elderly or people who can't afford a newer phone like myself

- Bringing on-street parking charges more in line with other cities, increasing the fee for an hour's parking by 50p to £2 an hour.

Our city is small and we don't get as much money so please don't. We want to encourage people to come to our city and not Exeter!

- Removing maximum stay restrictions in many central off-street parking locations

That's cool maybe allow some overnight parking for vans? Would be good for surfers and hikers who don't want to sleep on Dartmoor.

- Raising the price of residents' parking permits in line with inflation, from £30 to £41 a year

Maybe so it in three tiers so people on benefits pay less?

- Removing the annual visitor permits available in some zones to ensure a fair and consistent approach across the city

People should be allowed to have visitors it's unfair to allow some and not allow others.

- Increasing the cost of guest house and hotelier permits from £5 to £7 (still providing guests with a saving of £19 off the face value) and replacing paper permits with a more convenient digital system
- Simplifying off-street charges by introducing three 'bands' for car parks, with higher tariffs in the most popular and centrally located car parks such as Elphinstone, Mayflower East, St Andrews Street, North Hill and Guildhall (Band A) and better value tariffs in Bands B and C. Proposals would see short-stay prices increase and long-stay prices decrease in Bands A and B, with no changes in Band C (where the lowest tariffs apply)

This will again penalise disabilities and drive traffic towards Exeter.

- Allowing drivers to move from a Band A car park to any other car park if they have any unused time remaining, providing more flexibility, convenience and value
- Increasing the cost of short-stay business permits from £150 to £200 and long-stay from £300 to £400. Discounted rates will be kept as they are for NHS and health care workers, who will receive a new, dedicated health care permit replacing the discounted business permit
- Supporting local businesses by reducing the free parking period back to two hours (from three) at Mutley Barracks and Napier Street car parks, where drivers are often now parking to visit other locations, such as the city centre and university. An hour for food then two hours for picking up food or going to kids music class, should be kept at 3
- Tackling the issue of drivers overstaying their free parking time at district car parks (and making it difficult for other shoppers to park) by introducing a system where they must all register their session using an app or terminal. Drivers will not need to display a ticket.

Yet again not everyone uses a smart phone!

- Increasing the fee of the popular Accessibility Permit (which allows blue badge holders to park for free in certain car parks) from £40 to £60 a year but expanding it to include all car parks.

Disabilities already penalised and often poor, don't make it worse.

- Introducing a charge of £150 to cover the cost of installing a disabled parking space.

This should be free or way cheaper. People with disabilities are often in pain so if they can't afford a space they are stuck at home more if they struggle to walk to their car.

Dear Consultation re Parking in Plymouth

I am responding to request for comments on the parking charges proposals as a resident of Plymouth.

I have read the new proposals and would like to state that I am very much in agreement with you and support the need to take measures to reduce carbon footprint to address the Climate Emergency.

I am also broadly in agreement with proposals to achieve this by making it more expensive to use a car in the city.

And in general with your proposal to do this by raising parking fees across the widest range of personal use car journeys.

So as a city resident I am broadly supportive of these measures.

HOWEVER, and it's a big however, I think it is insufficient to achieve these carbon emission targets solely by punitive cost measures.

Especially at the start of a winter of discontent and likely very real hardship for many in the Cost of Living crisis we as a country face.

I cannot give wholehearted support to these measures as such (the Stick) UNLESS they are part of a two pronged strategy which also provides encouragement to leave the car at home (the Carrot).

By this I mean substantially enhanced PUBLIC TRANSPORT availability. People still need to get to work, to come to shop, and spend money in town...there needs to be much improved and more frequent bus services across and into the city, there needs to be the incentive to leave the car behind by making available very cheap or free travel (as has been done in some other cities, including in the US).

Without this it is difficult to see how residents of the city will support, or even be able to afford, punitive parking charges.

I am encouraged to see that the Council is encouraging a consultative process on this proposed action, and I offer my views in a spirit of helpfulness. We all want this to work to address the fearful evidence of the climate deterioration already on us.

I would appreciate an ACKNOWLEDGMENT of receipt of this submission, thank you

.....parking meters. No cash ok. CC ok BUT definitely not mobile only. The RINGO and similar service only is not acceptable.

I am sending you this email to register my objection against planned parking restriction that you intend to introduce.

As a small business, I can only confirm what other small businesses are going through with rising energy costs, fuel costs, and high inflation. Most employees travel to Plympton by car, and rely on free parking to earn a living. This will be a slap in the face with additional parking charges when they are already facing high costs already.

I strongly urge you to reconsider your plans as the economic situation is heading towards a storm in the next few months and try and help businesses and their staff not hinder them with more costs.

Amd.2022.2137287 Parking Modernisation

I have read with interest your proposed parking changes which I see include increasing the cost of residents parking permits. As a resident of Hermitage Road (PL3 4RU) and previously Wembury Park Rd (PL3 4NG), there is insufficient space for residential parking. May I suggest a 'tapered' pricing structure where the first vehicle costs, for example, £5, the second £50 and subsequent vehicles £250?

This would alleviate the pressure on many residents who are unable to park near their property because of others' multiple cars. It may also encourage public transport before multiple-car ownership.

Those who can least afford the parking charges probably have fewer cars and so would be less affected (especially if the fee for the first permit was a reduction in price).

I would like to make a representation on this parking proposal. Particularly with the parking on the Ridgeway, Plympton.

The Ridgeway is a community hub for those living in the local area who do not want to travel into town. With traffic worsening on Plymouth road and Marsh Mills, a lot of people avoid town and use Ridgeway instead. Adding a paid metre will make Ridgeway no different to town and will significantly damage our local community.

Two hours of free parking is not enough - a lot of hairdressers, mine included are at the Ridgeway. It's impossible to get your hair done in two hours when having full colour. This will mean people will start moving elsewhere. People and businesses.

To take a ticket on arrival even if for free - there's a lot of elderly who would forget this at times and therefore would be subject to fines. A lot of the local community spend the afternoon up Ridgeway - shopping, having a coffee with friends, to charge would result in this not happening. Instead people will start using the surrounding streets to park for free and walk to the Ridgeway. The roads are narrow and would cause a huge problem especially during rush hour when those roads can hardly deal with two lanes of traffic. Local residents a lot of whom don't have driveways, rely on on-street parking. This would not be as available as workers who are on long shifts at the Ridgeway would instead park outside residential houses rather than pay for parking each day.

Also a lot of people make use of the bars and pubs up Ridgeway in the evening and through the night. They park for free and leave their car to collect in the morning. If they have a two hour limit or have to pay to park, this will just encourage people to drink drive. This behaviour on the streets of Plympton will endanger life and increase fatalities without a doubt.

I appreciate the council have overspent and need this money back, but increasing parking charges isn't the right solution. You will be damaging already struggling businesses, meaning not as many businesses paying their tax, which will make the situation even worse. Cuts need to be made elsewhere in adult social care which is where the huge overspend is, not for something that is going to effect the majority whilst the minority still benefit.

In reference to proposals to increase parking costs - all this will achieve is people will park further afield to avoid paid car parks which will actually result in less income than previously. Or people will just stop traveling into town. Our businesses cannot cope with this. You only need look at the high street and big names are disappearing. Not to mention the effect this will have on small businesses and cafes who are already struggling. Increasing these costs is a sure way to kill the high street at a time when they need your support. There's no point in spending millions on the new Millbay walkway or Colin Campbell Court demolition or new trees and paving down the centre of town if there will be no shops to attract people.

I hope you reconsider this proposal as it will have a hugely detrimental effect on businesses and in turn our local community. That car park is the heart of Plympton and has been free for as long as I remember. Making this paid will kill the local community.

Having read the proposals I wish to make the following observations regarding raising the price of residents' parking permits in line with inflation, from £30 to £41 a year.

1. When Zoning was introduced my area became S and is now R which incorporates streets near to the University and the centre.
2. At the time we permanent residents were assured that the annual charge would never increase from the initial £15 per annum.
3. Subsequently the charge was doubled to the present £30.
4. If the charge is increased to £41 this cannot be argued that it is in line with inflation (presently hovering around 10%) as £11 extra onto £30 is a 36.66 % rise.
5. With the majority of households struggling at the present time, this is an added burden which many will find draconian, especially if pensioners unable to gain that extra income to cover such rises.

I think putting parking up isn't a good idea, with the cost of everything else going up going out and parking on the hoe etc. etc. will boost peoples sad life's at the moment, putting parking up is just another kick in the teeth for people!!! Why does everyone want to jump on the band wagon by upping prices. There won't be any pleasures left in life in a minute!!! What is wrong with people. As for making payment by app or card and taking payment by cash away well it's wrong

older people don't have modern technology they are happy to pay with cash and the less money people have , the more they will want to pay with cash then they can budget and no exactly how much they are spending. Your timing for this is rubbish you want to be attracting people to come here not sending them away! Other towns and cities earn more than this part of the country why punish us more!!! . The only good thing I can say is making the parking tickets flexible so people can move from place to place is a good thing if they have time left on ticket. When things are cheaper more people use them , which leads to more people come , which leads to them spending, which will help all the small businesses that are going to fold with the way things are

Whilst the need to raise Council funds is obvious I am concerned that increasing parking charges at a time when businesses are struggling, buses are unpredictable and social isolation a concern is not helpful.

Also requiring people to have an app unfairly discriminates against people without the funds or ability to manage a mobile phone

I'm a local resident (zone H) and also make use of a business permit.

Regarding your recent public consultation on the parking modernisation plan I'd like to make representation on a few points -

Removal of visitor passes-

We find these invaluable for visitors and are our only option living on the Hoe. I note the consultation mentions making it 'fair' to all but the discounted passes (correctly limited in number) were a fair way people living in popular areas could still have family or friends stay without penalising them financially. One option could be reducing who can access these - I understand lots of the local B&Bs provide them to their clients which should instead perhaps be paying the local rate- but could maintain them for residential addresses?

The new healthcare permit sounds interesting (and would likely replace my business permit). Could this allow parking (for a limited time; such as 2hrs) in pay and display places too? As a visiting GP often areas (particularly around the barbican) are only pay and display and these therefore limit where we can park such as to undertake a patient visit (the current business permit only allows use of residential spaces).

Thank you in advance for considering the above.

To whom it may concern

We strongly object to the possibility of parking charges in many car parks which are now free.

Including Plympton ice land car park.

I have read through the proposed changes, and I would like to comment on the increased price for resident's permits.

I am in the PL4 (BB) area and residents permits were introduced a couple of years ago, after suffering years of parking issues. This was welcomed, however, I was disappointed that the permit only comes into play for 3 hours in the morning and 3 hours in the evening. I have been working from home and see people parking up before 12pm and going off for the day, taking advantage of the free parking between 12pm and 6pm.

Due to the proposed increased price of our permits, could there be a review of the times these are valid for? Eg. 9am to 9pm.

Also what is meant by removing annual visitor's permits? I have used quite a few of these recently when having work done on my property. I haven't come across any businesses that have business permits on their vehicles.

How are friends and family supposed to visit if these are removed?

I look forward to hearing from you.

With reference to your proposal regarding the car park I strongly object to any changes to the present arrangements as charging or putting a time limit on this car park would be completely damaging for the ridgeway traders with a complete reduction in sales the restaurants and cafés also the conservative club would be hit very hard with any restrictions to the car park , the ridgeway will die and be a massive loss to Plympton, I remember what happened at the Broadway in Plymstock years ago which has never completely recovered .

Good evening

If PCC are considering payment changes to the small carpark to the immediate right of Theatre Royal, please bring these in line with matinee performances. As a regular attender, I fear receiving a parking ticket on every occasion I attend. Many thanks

Objection

We write to object to the proposed amendments to the Resident Visitor Parking Permit scheme in the Cross Park area of Crownhill.

A. This is a small, residential area, far from the City Centre and therefore does not compare with the other areas shown in the report, with their needs for transport access. Cross Park is not a thoroughfare. The only reason for entering the Cross Park area is as a resident or to visit a specific property.

There is, however, a road-safety issue in that if there are no visitor tickets available, the only alternative, other than parking in neighbouring streets with no restrictions, is the Crownhill, Alexandra Road car park, which has restrictive parking. The access road is narrow and any extra traffic build-up will cause more congestion and also take up spaces that would otherwise be used by people wishing to use the local business services.

There is also the extra safety issue, particularly for the elderly or infirm, of walking from the car park to the Cross Park area.

B. "Removing the Annual Visitor Permits available in some zones to ensure a fair and consistent approach across the City."

This is not a 'Reason', just a statement. However, as we currently hold a yearly Visitor Permit, it has to be assumed that it is for purely financial reasons.

Detrimental Effect on Residents

C. This proposal will cause a substantial, additional financial burden on most residents and equally seriously, the inability to have more than 90 visits by friends, carers, family, trades people etc. in any 12-month period. This is not only unjustifiable but also iniquitous, as those residents are being discriminated against because of living in a 'CPZ' area.

Many of the residents are older or elderly and look forward to visits from family and friends.

Over the years and increasingly during and subsequent to the Pandemic, we have been encouraged to engage with our elderly residents. The proposed measures seem to run counter to these wishes and could place an additional financial burden on the Council in the long-run, because friends and family may be unable to make timely visits to ensure the well-being of elderly or needy residents.

There are also, of course, younger residents who also have friends and family who wish to visit. Additionally, if residents are unable to use on-street parking, they may well find it necessary to create a parking space out of what is now a garden area, thereby removing valuable green space.

Cost ramifications

D. On reading various reports regarding Local authority parking charges, the clear implication is that authorities should not use parking charges as simply a revenue-gathering scheme. Looking at the figures below, P.C.C. can hardly be said to be doing anything else.

The current charge for an annual visitor permit is £15. The proposed and quite frankly, scandalous charges are as follows:

£20 for 30 tickets 33% increase in cost for an 8% maximum possible number of visits

£55 for 60 tickets 266% increase in cost for a 16% maximum possible number of visits

£100 for 90 tickets 566% increase in cost for a 24% maximum possible number of visits

As the highest increase in other proposed parking charges appears to relate to the Accessibility Permit, which will rise from £40 to £60 - a 50% increase in cost, the residents of the Cross Park area seem to be being particularly shabbily treated.

Summary

We understand that it is illegal for Local Authorities to raise parking charges solely for the provision of revenue to provide for other activities and that the level of charges should be based on the need to manage parking. It appears that Section 55 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 does

not provide Local Authorities with powers to set parking charges at a level greater than that needed to relieve or prevent traffic congestion. We would also point out that if a Local Authority sets parking charges in order to raise revenue, it can be deemed to be acting "ultra vires" if it cannot show that the proposed charges are necessary to relieve or prevent traffic congestion. It appears that the proposals at The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) Amendment No: 2022 2137287 in relation to the Crownhill Area do not manage parking or either relieve or prevent traffic congestion.

We therefore invite you to review this objection and withdraw the proposed changes to the Visitor Parking Permit scheme in the Crownhill Area. Surely in the best interests of all concerned, it would be sensible and equitable to increase the cost of the Visitor Permit in line with that of the Resident Parking permit.

My comments.

- 1) Accepting payment via Apple Pay/Android pay is really important.
- 2) Some free car parks seem to have become a place to store cars/camper vans which rarely move, such as the one near the Cremyll ferry (Strand street). Having some time limit or responsibility to get a free ticket on a daily basis could solve this and owners may store their cars/camper vans elsewhere, so these car parks can be better used by transient users who really need to park. E.g. To access the ferry, shop or local businesses like Elvira's café in the example of the Cremyll car park.

Ideas (for future?)

Residential parking zones: Personally I think some zones have too many cars for the number of spaces, and perhaps there should be a limit on how many cars per household are allowed, perhaps based on the council tax band. And those properties which pay no council tax (e.g. student houses) be limited to zero or one permit.

After visiting some other cities I think the idea of underground car parks could be considered – as these can really make an area more friendly and appealing by 'hiding' the parking underground.

Pay on exit car parks could encourage visitors to the city centre to stay longer, compared to paying at time of parking

The proposals aim to maintain the support of free parking and introduce additional parking controls.

My comments address issues that are likely to arise from the proposals as they affect the Plympton Ridgeway area district car parks.

Whilst there may be some abuse of limited stay, there needs to be adequate 'long stay' parking for those who work in retail, hospitality, and service businesses in the Ridgeway.

The introduction of additional parking controls will only result in the 'long stayers' migrating to the parking areas at the Library, Swimming Pool / Gym, Harewood House and Plympton Health Centre, limiting available parking to users of these key local facilities and for Plympton Cricket, Bowls & Tennis Clubs. It is stretching the imagination to believe that such controls will 'support shops and local businesses'.

Whilst the support of free parking is welcome, there is a strongly held belief that the introduction of additional parking controls can only be a precursor to charging. Charging will only result in displacement to the parking areas at the Library, Swimming Pool / Gym, Harewood House and Plympton Health Centre, and then to surrounding streets with the consequent chaos that will cause.

Free car parking is addressed in the policies of Plympton St Mary Neighbourhood Plan, namely PSM6 - "Free and good parking facilities are key to the success of the established retail and employment areas ...", and EC3 - "Support the policy for free parking to be maintained in all public car parks within Plympton."

In summary, the proposals as they affect Plympton are a proverbial sledgehammer to crack a nut, with the (obvious) intention to introduce charging by stealth, which will destroy trading and businesses in the Ridgeway.

I spotted this consultation on Twitter and as a Plymouth resident in an area with residents' parking permits want to respond: I'd expected a form to fill in but as that does not seem to be the case please accept this email:

- Increase cost of resident's parking permits: that is fine, as it has not changed for many years. I assume increased costs will also apply to resident's visitors permits – these will need to stay paper-based as individual visitors, who may also be tradespeople, cannot be expected to register online.
- Removal of cash payment option for car parking: I am opposed to this as it discriminates against older drivers who are less likely to have smartphones or be able to download apps or are reluctant to make financial transactions on their phones for justifiable security reasons. It would be more acceptable if every car parking site had functioning card payment facilities, though they rarely do.
- Increasing the cost of annual business permits: this will hit small businesses such as carpenters, handy people, and electricians etc. who are already working on very tight margins due to the increased costs of everything. It will make it more difficult for residents of restricted zones to find tradespeople for their urgent and important jobs. I do not agree with this proposal.
- Health and Care Passes: I did not know these existed, but I am shocked that domiciliary carers who get paid such low wages on poor conditions of service are also expected to find £200 for a parking permit. This is disgraceful and the Council should make these passes free, especially as the costs of them are likely to be built in to charges made to the Council for delivering care services, thereby simply creating costs in another Council department.
- Reducing free period in Mutley Plain car parks will negatively impact on businesses in Mutley Plain which are largely service providers such as hairdressers, health and education providers. 2 hours is too short for an adult learning class or a hair appointment, beauty treatment or solicitor's appointment. The increase to 3 hours has been really valuable and should remain in place. Making city centre car parks easier and cheaper to access would resolve any use of Mutley parking for city centre activity
- Overall increase in parking charges: the Council needs to look at the City Centre and see how many empty shops and business premises there are, and realise that a significant increase in parking charges will only make this worse. An inflation level increase is to be expected but beyond that is ridiculous, since most of the towns surrounding Plymouth where people might go instead to shop have easier and cheaper parking.

I don't agree with not being able to pay for parking by using cash as My sight is very poor and can't use app's on a phone and also have difficulty reading instruction on the pay machine as it's usually small writing and confusing.

Also there are many people usually older people who don't understand all the new technology. What are you going to do for them?

Fleece us a bit more why don't you, don't help us A

I live in a terraced house at St Jude's, where I currently pay to park outside on the street. This would be acceptable if it was for the whole day, however it is for just one hour a day. Living near the park, once that hour is over anyone and everyone can park for the rest of the day. You made the original arrangements in order to stop people who worked in the city centre from parking all day while they went to work. Since the city centre is now devoid of shops, offices and workers it no longer makes sense. The remaining workers now park in Lanhydrock road all day long, along with people who live in their vans, and motor homes, causing congestion on a road which has many children crossing it daily, in order to get to school. I object strenuously to having increased parking charges.

Please find my comments to the parking proposals **in red**:

- Removing cash payments and modernising and upgrading all on-street systems to accept payments by phone (via Apple and Android Pay for example), credit and debit cards and mobile apps, offering greater choice and convenience for drivers and removing the need

to use cash, which helps reduce the city's carbon footprint. I do not agree with this proposal. It discriminates against the non-digital, the elderly and those who do not wish to use their phones to make payments. Using mobile apps depends on good signal which is not always available. It is difficult to read phones at night time, during storms and can be time consuming. There is no back up when systems fail. I have had to leave car parks because I have not been able to make a digital payment. Please keep cash options.

- Bringing on-street parking charges more in line with other cities, increasing the fee for an hour's parking by 50p to £2 an hour. I do not agree with this proposal. High streets such as Plymouth are already dying. Increasing parking charges will accelerate this demise.
- Removing maximum stay restrictions in many central off-street parking locations. I do not agree with this proposal. It appears to contradict a 'green' approach to the city and will surely create more demand for parking spaces.
- Raising the price of residents' parking permits in line with inflation, from £30 to £41 a year. This proposal seems reasonable.
- Removing the annual visitor permits available in some zones to ensure a fair and consistent approach across the city. More details are needed to comment on this proposal. How much are the annual visitor permits?
- Increasing the cost of guest house and hotelier permits from £5 to £7 (still providing guests with a saving of £19 off the face value) and replacing paper permits with a more convenient digital system. This proposal seems reasonable.
- Simplifying off-street charges by introducing three 'bands' for car parks, with higher tariffs in the most popular and centrally located car parks such as Elphinstone, Mayflower East, St Andrews Street, North Hill and Guildhall (Band A) and better value tariffs in Bands B and C. Proposals would see short-stay prices increase and long-stay prices decrease in Bands A and B, with no changes in Band C (where the lowest tariffs apply). I would only agree with this proposal if the tariff for Band A does not exceed the current cost.
- Allowing drivers to move from a Band A car park to any other car park if they have any unused time remaining, providing more flexibility, convenience and value. This proposal seems reasonable and appears to be the only imaginative proposal so far.
- Increasing the cost of short-stay business permits from £150 to £200 and long-stay from £300 to £400. Discounted rates will be kept as they are for NHS and health care workers, who will receive a new, dedicated health care permit replacing the discounted business permit. I do not agree with this proposal. Post-covid business are already struggling. Likewise petrol fees and energy bills across the sector have increased dramatically.
- Supporting local businesses by reducing the free parking period back to two hours (from three) at Mutley Barracks and Napier Street car parks, where drivers are often now parking to visit other locations, such as the city centre and university. Possibly. Or provide more park and ride facilities and bicycle lanes?
- Tackling the issue of drivers overstaying their free parking time at district car parks (and making it difficult for other shoppers to park) by introducing a system where they must all register their session using an app or terminal. Drivers will not need to display a ticket I do not agree with this proposal for reasons given above.
- Increasing the fee of the popular Accessibility Permit (which allows blue badge holders to park for free in certain car parks) from £40 to £60 a year but expanding it to include all car parks. No comment. What do Blue Badge Holders wish? Has a survey been done to establish the justification for this change?
- Introducing a charge of £150 to cover the cost of installing a disabled parking space. This is an unclear proposal. Who would pay the charge? Where would these parking spaces be created? What is the system for creating new disabled parking spaces atm?

I have recently read the proposals with regards to "Raising the price of residents parking" within Plymouth, and especially within certain zones.

I live in zone 'R' and I am charged £30 per annum. If I lived half a mile away I would be charged nothing. Having lived here for nearly 40 years, I have probably been charged for parking my car outside my house for about 20 years, about £600 more than someone who lives half a mile away. I think it is time that residents stopped being charged for parking permits and you made everyone within Plymouth the same and didn't discriminate against us.

Surely it would be better if you put parking meters in all the streets that residents are now charged for, and started getting the money that way. It would take the burden off of the residents and make it fairer on the people who live in the city, like myself.

I feel sure that if you had a parking restriction from 10am till 5pm and people had to pay then the residents would be far happier. I feel that it is a very unfair proposal and especially as you are proposing to increase it to £4!

Shame on the council for not treating everyone the same.

Increasing parking charges in the town will result in reduced footfall and therefore customers for shops, restaurants, etc.

It would be more inventive to reduce charges.

I would like to bring to everyone's attention to the outrageous car parking proposals and misinformation put out recently Plymouth's city council.

They are proposing putting up the city centre charges to £2 an hour to "align with other parts of the country". There are no towns or cities that I can see this side of Bristol that have a £2 an hour charge.

They are also proposing to offer greater choice of payment options by.....wait for it.....REMOVING the option of paying by cash!! In their naivety they are assuming every one carries a smart phone and has the App. Where in fact 4.5 million people in this country do not. By the way using the App for a transaction comes at a cost of 20p. So your 1 hour has just cost you £2.20, but they don't want to tell you that.

The council in its document boasts about the free parking arrangement (if you've got the App) in areas such as Mutley Plain to help attract footfall. So, by the same argument they must be seeking to de-incentivise footfall in the city centre by inflating their charges.

And to add insult to injury they dress this whole package up as "Helping to tackle the Climate Crisis"

They must think we are all docile mugs who will just lap up these emotive, tug on your conscience, sound bites that have absolutely no substance.

If you feel you are as outraged as I am at these proposals and the window dressing around them, please share with your friends and give feedback to the council regarding this public consultation to: [trafficmanagementinbox@plymouth.gov.uk](mailto:trafficmanagementinbox@plymouth.gov.uk)

If you are going to change times maybe just a couple of hrs once a day to stop town workers would do or stop them completely as the only difference since it started is cost

With reference to the residents' permit increase of 35%, I'm appalled at the untimely 35% increase when the mostly poorer off inner city residents are penalised yet again. I expected a 10% rise "in line with inflation", but 35%? Cruel. It reminds me of the huge 300% increase over the last 5 years on our allotment rentals. Totally ignoring the whole idea and ethos behind council allotments for those mainly with no suitable gardens. When taken in context of the massive overall PCC spending budget, allotment and resident parking increases are miniscule, yet affect the poorest residents on average the most. To invoke a 14 year stable permit price as an excuse for a 35% rise this year at a time when everything is going through the roof, especially for the poorest, is insulting our intelligence. You should be proud of no increase in parking permits over the last 14 years, not desperately reversing that fine record.

You say you want residents' comments and consultation, but I remember 3 or 4 years ago attending a couple of "consultations" under a previous administration on how the £9m grant should be spent in Central Park. On several issues, those meetings made it quite clear what residents felt on a range of issues, only for those charged with overseeing the grant intimating that the decisions were already made, centralised life centre area footfall was all important, and that we would be ignored. Local consultations and comments are a mythical box ticking exercise.

I'm very sorry I feel this way, but that is my comment. I understand the huge austerity forced on local councils for years now, but it should not be the most needy that pay the highest percentage price.

I fear the next big issue to affect us inner city poorer people will be air quality and those of us who sadly cannot afford a new electric car and will be hugely punished fiscally for just leaving our apartment in our older vehicle. We will, in effect, be fiscally banned from owning a car. How about planning to punish everybody equally for once? It's the only way our community will accept the new rules coming

I really feel it is not in the best interests of traders or customers to start charging in the Ridgeway car parks. Life is hard enough as it is n food costs rising and our utility bills along with petrol. Please reconsider!

1. I believe by removing the facility to accept cash payments this is discriminatory towards people who do not have smart phones and elderly people who do not understand technology or the ability to use it, and also people who do not wish to link a bank card to an app for fear of being scammed or the app being hacked.

2. I understand the need to increase Parking Charges, but as Parking Enforcement, especially in Permit Only Streets is near enough totally non-existent, I wonder what any increase would be used for? Certainly not to enforce parking strictly, which is what we are paying for with Parking Permits and Meter Charges.

3. The council is failing TOTALLY in enforcement of Disabled Bays and the abuse of people using Blue Badges that they are not entitled to use ( i.e. Using other peoples badges without the holder being present, to park for work and constantly popping back to change the clock time!!!!) 4. The council is also failing to enforce any parking in the town centre areas, such as access only areas, outside the Mall for an example, which people regularly park daily, especially after 5pm at night, creating a serious hazard to pedestrians and cyclists!!.

5. I understand the need to raise the fee for applying for a Blue Badge holder Bay in a residential area, Permit or not, however, these bays are unenforceable, so, again you are penalising the Disabled for a facility that is totally open to abuse!!!!

6. I would be grateful if these issues and concerns could be raised at the proposed meeting and addressed. Parking Charges, Permit Charges to be raised is understandable, however, Parking Enforcement MUST be raised as well as the issues I have raised please.

I think a price rise from £30.00 to £41.00 for a parking permit at this time of high energy prices is very over the top. £30.00 to £35.00 is fair. Especially as the likelihood of actually getting a parking space in some areas once the students return is highly unlikely. Especially zone C. I'm also against the removal of guest parking tickets. Although you haven't stated which zones. Please update Happy for the free parking to be reduced to 2 hours in Mutley, I can see how this word be beneficial.

These are my main concerns.

I am writing regarding the above.

One thing that hasn't been mentioned in your proposal that I can see is planning permission for new commercial units where the blue badge/disabled parking is currently frequently placed unacceptably and uselessly too far from the building entrance.

As an example, take Aldi in Southway. The child parking spaces are right outside, bravo, but the disabled bays are around the side and towards the rear of the building. That means a person who can't walk far, most people who hold a blue badge in fact, must walk nearly the length of the store to even be able to get into the building! How much sense does that make? I certainly can't go there.

Tesco in Transit Way has a great deal of disabled parking but you might notice how little of it is used because it runs in a straight line away from the building entrance! I have to wait for a space to become available that I can actually use and therefore usually choose to shop elsewhere entirely, much further away to drive for me.

There are so many examples of this across the city. Add onto that this council's refusal to promote the blue badge dropping off/collecting rule, those of us who are single are left with a massive lack of parking.

The above rule means that a disabled bay may be used by an able-bodied person to drive and drop a person with disabilities off, but they must either leave the car as well or park elsewhere and then collect the disabled person at the time required. Otherwise, that bay is being misused and, in fact, the council loses income through lack of parking ticket revenue.

This part of the government's regulations covers this:

Who can use the badge?

The badge is for your use and benefit only. It must only be displayed if you are travelling in the vehicle as a driver or passenger, or if someone is collecting you or dropping you off and needs to park at the place where you are being collected or dropped.

Don't allow other people to use the badge to do something on your behalf, such as shopping or collecting something for you.

- You must never give the badge to friends or family to allow them to park for free, even if they are visiting you.
- You should not use the badge to allow non-disabled people to take advantage of the benefits while you sit in the car.
- It's a criminal offence to misuse a badge. This includes people other than the badge holder taking advantage of the parking concessions provided under the scheme.

I have repeatedly asked the council to promote this on their Facebook page but be met with nothing but refusal. The wording itself in this rule isn't clear enough so many people end up abusing this, leaving single people unable to park once again.

When will this council wake up to disability rights?

Firstly I'd like to say I think it's appalling that you're even thinking about increasing the cost of basically every aspect of parking in the city centre considering what is currently going on in this climate. People are going to struggle to heat and feed their children this difference is going to have a huge impact on these people.

I do not think these changes are appropriate or will have any positive impact on our city, you are just going to deter people like myself from paying for parking in our city and going into the town centre. There is nothing in town we can't get online people are not going to pay fuel prices parking prices to go into town to get these items when there are easier means have you thought about that?

You have quoted that you are raising the prices in line with other cities this is highly unfair as other cities most likely have higher wages. Have you thought about that?

As a new mum to a 13 week baby I have found myself avoiding town more and more and getting upset and stressed out due to the lack of family spaces yet expensive looking cars are parked in there. Firstly this should be manned as is not fair that I have to drive around to try and get a space because of the lack of them yet there are about 80% more disabled spaces which might I add are empty the majority of the time. I am unable to get my baby out of the side door if I do not have the space to open my door. Too many times I have stood crying unsure of what to do. You need to sort this!!!!

Lastly I don't think you are going to take in any of the peoples opinions (who pay our taxes) you already have a plan and are going to make the increase regardless but at least I did my bit. You should be ashamed of yourselves.

This is an absolute disgrace and as far as I can see just a way for the fat cats at Plymouth City Council to line their pockets.

I don't agree with updating car parks to be cashless. Believe it or not, not everyone has a smart phone do would be discouraged from visiting the city centre

I certainly don't agree with raising city centre parking charges to match other cities in the country. In case you hadn't noticed, we live in the south west and have the lowest wages in the country.

I don't agree with charging £150 for a disabled bay. Why should people be out of pocket because they have a disability and need to park close to their homes? This is discrimination and you should be ashamed of thinking about it.

Why raise the annual charge of the annual disabled pass for the city centre? This is just pure greed.

Residents parking. Seriously? You want to put the charge up? What exactly do Residents get for their money? When you tried to introduce that scheme for St Budeaux Square, you were more bothered about the local traders than the residents. That's why it didn't get voted for.

Finally, a lot of people are on their knees financially at the moment, with the cost of living crisis we are all experiencing, how can you even consider these increases? Talk about kick people when they are down.

All this council do is take take take. Give something back for once

Has the council considered bringing in parking permits for residential roads where houses have drives and/or garages which the owners persist in not using, instead causing road users difficulties by parking on the roads instead. May be the council should look at issues this causes, the breakdown of the road surface because drivers are continually driving on the only piece of road available when cars are parked on both sides of the road. Pedestrians not being able to use the pavement. A drive down Merafield road towards underwood road, Merafield drive, Amado's drive etc. would give you an idea of what I am talking about.

Have paid for permits been issued for cars to be parked on the newly created Billacombe road Plymouth parking spaces? Are the owners paying for this parking which has been created on the road, where the upkeep I presume is funded by the motorists?

If the parking charges continue to rise this will push more people to shop on line, I always consider what it will now cost me in parking if I am thinking of shopping in Plymouth city centre, I consider any costs of having the items delivered instead and I will say 9 out of 10 times its less expensive to have it delivered than go into the city. The knock on effect is that I don't get encouraged into buying items I hadn't planned on, saves me money but doesn't do the businesses any good.

As the generation gets older and those living in the more rural areas of the county rely on driving into the city parking is still going to be required.

However I don't understand why a blue badge cannot be issued (either free or small admin costs) but the driver pays the same as others parking in the carparks, the benefit they get is that the dedicated parking is much nearer to amenities. I have always thought this would be fairer to all, as there are people who work in the city every day and either get free disabled parking or cheaper rates than others, when really their need is access to parking closer to the amenities, not subsidised parking costs.

It would be interesting if you published how much cash is used in parking machines, which could give substance to the decisions you are making that everyone wants to pay by card or phone.

I do think the council could be more progressive and set up 'working groups', volunteers who have experience in 'real life' that could pass on their ideas and real expertise.

Thanking you for taking time in reading my comments.

I love my city, it would be great to see it as a leader rather than a 'follower'.

I do not think it is in the best interests of every motorist to make all city car parks cashless. Many very elderly motorists do not have a mobile phone (maybe by choice), & also do have/or use any type of credit/debit card.

Using car parks in The Barbican frequently, I have experienced what a nuisance this can be.

I have been queued with young & old.....the machines are not that easy for people to use, even when you are completely computer literate, & know what you are doing. I have seen people really struggling to pay.....the queue gets bigger, & is also very embarrassing for the person who is trying to pay for their parking.

How can this be making things any easier for the average motorist, especially when large events are being held in the city. People queuing, just get very irate. Paying with cash was much quicker & simpler.

I also think that taking away cash payments, is taking away people's rights. I wasn't a where that we are now living in a totally cashless society!!!!

I also think that blue badge holders, should not have to pay to park anywhere, especially, as in some car parks, there are so few spaces for people with disabilities!!!!

#### Objection To Removal Of Annual Visitor Parking Permit

I would like to comment on your recent proposals to remove the Annual Visitor Parking Permit. Where I live we have had a Residents Parking Scheme in operation for years. (Zone CB)

The Residents originally agreed with you, to have this scheme in force to stop workers and shoppers parking in our neighbourhood. The scheme which we agreed to consists of an Annual Resident Permit and an Annual Visitor Permit.

I would like to voice my objection to your recent proposal to remove the Annual Visitor Permit and replace it with single permits, a maximum of 90 for the year.

Surely limiting the number of visitors any resident can have in a year is discrimination. Residents have numerous visitors, for various reasons and nobody should be limited by our Council as to how many visitors we can see.

We need to keep our Annual Visitor Permit. Your recent proposals are NOT the scheme we agreed to have in force when we agreed to have a parking scheme in our neighbourhood. At the time we agreed to have it, we would not have expected you to propose, as you are doing, to change the scheme.

Another point I would like to draw your attention to - During School Term Time, from about 3.00pm onwards we very often have non- residents parking in our neighbourhood waiting to collect children from Widey Primary, this time is when our Resident Parking Scheme is in force.

1. Parking meters should and must take the basic form of payment, cash. I for one do not take a phone or cards with me on most occasions.
2. There should be no raising of parking charges. I avoid town because of that very point already if I can and will not shop in the town centre due to heavy parking charges. Parking fees should be dropped to increase footfall or the city will get even worse, if it can!
3. Residents parking should be FREE and not increased, residents are already under financial hardship and this will add to their burden.
4. Increasing the cost of "guest" parking areas will just drive more away from visiting Plymouth, and our city is already dying.
5. Tariffs city wide should be one price as people have no idea what cash they should carry.
6. Short stay "business" tariffs should be lowered not increased! Who comes up with these ideas beats me as it's if they are trying to drive businesses out of Plymouth because of greed.
7. NHS staff and cares workers should have FREE parking within working hours, city wide!
8. Plymouth council are saying they want to increase blue badge holders permit charges, this is discrimination at the least as these people should be prioritised and we should make life as cost effective as we can for them.
- 9- Parking machines in the city are always broken, one on Swary street has been out of action for about six months, and we expect them to be fixed on the same day they fail. More parking is needed to revive Plymouth and cost-effective parking is needed as we might as well shop on Amazon if not, and this drives people away from the shopping areas. It feels as if these proposals are just an attack on the pockets of the working people of Plymouth who are already financially burdened with high cost and a silly overpriced council tax bill.

Is PCC trying to make the people of Plymouth poor?

Having read the proposals to increase the permit charges by 36% , which I consider rather excessive, whilst I understand the need to increase all fees due to the financial predicament, we are all suffering, I would like you to consider the following;

I live in the BB parking zone, our area has residents parking times from 0900 to 1200 then 1800 to 2100, we have problems with non-residents parking for the six hours between permit hours that

is detrimental to shift workers/ teachers/anyone with medical appointments, I have witnessed on many occasions non-residents parking then going into town on foot or by bus then returning 3-4 hrs later with shopping, therefore depriving the council of much needed parking revenue, also in this area of the BB zone we have a lot of industrial units who also use it as a free parking space, I therefore suggest perhaps change the permit hours to operate from 0900 to 2100 and not increase the parking permit prices for people who live here.

I would like to register my objection to the proposed large increase in charges for resident parking permits.

I live in Hillside Avenue where more permits are issued than there are parking spaces on the street, and then to have to pay more for sometimes having to park streets away from where we live is an insult. Whilst understanding that employees have to be paid to monitor the system this is a huge jump in charges. I strongly urge you all to reconsider how much the increase will be.

Don't move away from cash or card payment meters for parking. I know many people who would not be able to use them and would have to stop visiting the city.

Sadly it's a simple fact we have to pay more for most things including parking.

I agree to the cost increase in principle however will the Council look to provide more on street charging for electric vehicles including a scheme allowing residents to apply or at least enquire about having On street Charging installed in residential areas.

This in itself would assist residents making a choice of vehicle and would encourage use of EV's thus helping to get to net zero carbon.

Would any of the additional revenue raised be used towards improving public transport with the aim to remove use of cars?

Is the Council looking to install Low Emission Zones within the city?

Plympton has three free car parks Ridgeway/Mudway and Chaddlewood do you intend to make chargeable?

I pay £30 per year for permit parking in DD AREA Mutley Lipson area from 2pm till 7 pm. This needs to be reviewed. We only need an hour in the middle of the day at the most in fact I think you should scrap the permit parking as I still can't get a parking space when the students arrive. We have no choice but to pay it. You won't drop it as it is easy money for you.

Not everyone can use an app when parking, please include paying by debit card in all car parks and parking meters.

I have read the recent consultation and whilst I like everyone else, am affected by the cost of living crisis, I do understand the need to increase parking charges and limit times to central parking spaces.

I do feel that the parking at mutely barracks etc...should stay as 3 hours. I feel 2 hours will serve to dissuade shoppers from even going there for social and shopping reasons. I have a small child and we visit the church stay and play group, a cafe and the charity shops weekly. This usually takes about 2-3 hours. Sometimes grandma accompanies us but she is disabled and has mobility issues and this adds some time to the outing. This group and weekly outing is a lifeline to other mums like me who struggle with more costly activities. In addition, as an ex support worker for disabled persons we regularly went to Mutley to shop in the charity shops and go to cafes. The parking made it accessible and quieter than town so less overwhelming to some. Bus travel is tricky for many of the disabled persons I worked with.

I do wonder about the introduction of a permit for residents with more than 1/2 cars in other areas. I live in a place where many residents own at least 3 cars and the majority use on street parking. Introducing a permit of say £100 (increasing per car) annually will perhaps encourage them to limit cars per household. This will help reduce the household's carbon footprint and the revenue could be used to fund green initiatives, or be used to offset parking charges elsewhere.

I live In Plympton. If you were to introduce parking charges it will push people to park in residential areas which would cause a lot of issues. Parking outside your own house is at a premium and if new people park up the main road by Old Priory it does limit viewing pedestrians. A lot of people use harewood house and the library and the tennis and bowling green in plympton . If this area stays free then it will be full all the time. harewood is an absolute blessing for older

people and if suddenly my Parents were unable to park or if I could not park with my mum we wouldn't be able to go. My mum has dementia so dropping her and then parking the car would not be an option.

Ridgeway has lots hairdressers and places to eat. To limit to 2 hours would cause anxiety for people having to get back to their car or to think about parking.

We are

In a cost of living crisis too so please support our community by not imposing charges.

Please reconsider.

If it helps re costing. Plympton has an amazing community we have the Plympton Litter Pickers who have saved the council many call outs by cleaning up glass and mess in parks. Even cutting back brambles the other week.

Other residents and groups have cut grass verges where it was dangerously high at junctions.

Please take this into consideration

Zone BB Cattedown area.

I am in agreement with the rise in the charge for the Residents Parking Permits. However, myself and others in the area do not believe that the exclusion times were reviewed after the initial 12 months, there are still parking problems in late afternoons, and almost impossible if you return from an evening theatre or cinema programme. The current times Mon - Sun 09:00 - 12:00 and 18:00 - 21:00 need to be extended (as was originally mooted in the consultation meetings) to Mon - Sun 09:00 - 22:00, (as a bare minimum, Mon - Sun 09:00 - 12:00 and 15:00 - 21:00) this will allow shift workers and theatre / cinema goers etc. a fighting chance in finding a parking slot somewhere.

There are also a large and growing number of commercial (local / national) vans, lorries and hackney / private hire vehicles currently seeming to have residents permits (the residents who attended consultation meetings) were assured that these vehicles would not be eligible for Residents Parking Permits.

There also seems to be no action taken by any authorities to remove any vehicles which do not meet the requirements for Residents Parking Permits or legal / road worthiness requirements. Currently a vehicle (WR52VGO) has been untaxed since 1st October 2021, has had no MOT since 5th December 2020, and has been SORN (but still parked on the public highway) since at least 10th December 2021. This vehicle does not comply (and has not complied) with the main requirements for Residents Parking Permits, yet is still parked outside of 106 Mainstone Avenue, (and has been since April 2021) how does it do this? Simple, it has a car cover which prevents the Registration Number being read (yet another traffic offence 'not displaying a Registration Plate'). I have reported this vehicle on several occasions, via the council website, to the DVLA, and the community Police officer, who says they will only intervene, 'if it commits moving traffic violation', all other violations being now considered to be dealt with by 'the local council'.

There are also several motorcycles / scooters parked on pavements (I suspect they have no permits).

I also believe that residents who have moved out of the area, are still managing to obtain permits, as their families are still local residents.

Resident parking is an emotive subject, whilst the majority actually abide by the rules, the system is still being abused by a few.

Dear friends I strongly object to the proposal of installing meters at Plympton car parks initially for 2 hours free parking for the following reasons

It will push parking to already congested side streets

The council will want to recover cost of installing meters so 2hrs free will soon become a 24 hour charge period

It will be damaging to local businesses taking people away from the shops to supermarkets and out of town shopping areas where it is free

Parking at Harewood house sporting facilities tennis, cricket swimming pool will become even more tenuous, it becomes very busy now with parking on grass areas, naturally illegal but not policed

My only comment is:

With inflation forecast to go over 10%, possibly as high as 18%. Electricity / gas rising for both domestic and business users forecasted at around 300% in 18 month period. Now is not the time to increase parking costs, if they are raised especially in city centre, shoppers will move, even faster, to on line retailers. Which will cause businesses to fail leading to higher unemployment and more empty shops.

Now is the time to help people of Plymouth not add to their financial burden at the same time supporting local and national businesses particularly in the city centre.

Your proposal to abolish the use of cash and introduce parking via phone apps is discriminatory to people, myself included who do not own or want to own a mobile smartphone. The elderly are particularly at a disadvantage introducing modern technology and this group of people prefer to use cash.

In this current situation to put up parking charges is ludicrous. People are already struggling so nobody will go shopping in town!

Above all, parking schemes should recognise that one size does not fit all localities, so it is good to see more flexibilities such as portable tickets for off street parking, and removing maximum stay limits where appropriate.

Permits I support the introduction of a carers permit, and an increase in the cost of permits in general. However parking for residents in high density areas continues to disadvantage people in buildings where planning restrictions are in place, excluding eligibility for parking permits for both residents and visitors. A fairer solution might be to limit permits to a second car only - other residents can purchase one per resident with no limit, and to remove the exclusion for visitor permits.

Digital technology I do not support the removal of the option to pay by cash - this is an ageist attitude disguised as modernisation. I have heard numerous complaints both during covid and since! Plymouth is a tourist destination, but businesses also rely on local trade in the hospitality and retail sectors. Experiences so far show that signage is unclear and machinery unreliable. Small things like it not being easy to pay for parking will not bring visitors back to the City, parking meters are often not well lit (Cornwall Street for example), and the RingGo App is definitely not customer friendly. Whether parking for leisure or business reasons, people don't want to spend 10 minutes on the kerb figuring the system out! I do not support the move away from the option of paper permits - guest houses and small hotels want to give guests quick and easy access to parking.

Extension of overnight tariffs I would support this especially in the Hoe area with its large tourist sector. We want to use the big ticket events and Graduation ceremonies to showcase Plymouth and bring visitors back, this is another instance where we need to make Plymouth a positive experience. Currently the 8am finish is too early for hotel guests having breakfast or a leisurely start, and for many residents who would not be leaving for work this early.

Motor homes a lot of large vehicles park in the vicinity of the Hoe, reducing visibility for traffic in congested streets, and generally not enhancing the experience for tourists in the area. Could consideration be given to prohibiting parking of vehicles over a certain size in streets in the immediate area?

I am too late to reply in full to the changes proposed. However, I think at a time of increased financial strain to the extent that we may see people dying because they cannot afford to live... increasing charges to park is conscious cruelty. It will add pressure, it will result in increased financial distress, and it will starve the city of footfall necessary for its survival. I think it is a road to greater financial problems for all – individuals and businesses who rely on people coming into town to spend a reducing pot of money.

It's a mistake. It will lose you votes and it will lose any confidence. If you want to support people, you need to do the exact opposite to what you propose and tell people you are making a decision to NOT increase charges given the current financial difficulties they face.

I understand that the prices have to go up, but please think carefully before stopping payment with cash.

I have a lot of elderly friends who find it very difficult to use any other form of payment other than cash.

Do take into account the age population not just in Plymouth but those that visit from other parts of Devon.

I have several people say to me they just want be going into Plymouth if this comes into force. Please think of our parents, grandparents etc.

To: quoting reference 'Amd.2022.2137287 Parking Modernisation') to: Service Director for Street Services, Plymouth City Council, Ballard House, West Hoe Road, Plymouth, PL1 3BJ via email: [trafficmanagementinbox@plymouth.gov.uk](mailto:trafficmanagementinbox@plymouth.gov.uk) **Removing cash payments** – This has a very negative impact and prevents people from going to the City Centre at all. It also fails to give people a choice. Most of the apps require a service provider such as Google and Apple Pay to download the App. Information therefore is shared with parties who are not even part of the transaction, being a breach of data protection, for those who choose not to use Google or Apple. Also apps such as Ringo require a mobile telephone number before you can even access their system, also again a breach of data that is imposed. Failure of working machines in a carpark therefore means you either have to go elsewhere or divulge your personal data against your wishes, even if you are prepared to use a payment or credit card. Using “*which helps reduce the city’s carbon footprint*” as an excuse for failing to offer the option of paying by cash is appalling and could be considered a form of bullying and dogmatism. Cash is still legal tender and the only option for many.

If machines are not working then car parking should be free, to incentivise the servicing company of machines is maintained at 100%, or as near as.

**Bringing on-street parking charges more in line with other cities** – Plymouth is poorly served by on-street parking. The layout of the City Centre and proposed layout is very poor. It has become unbalanced, in favour of pedestrians. The original street layout of the City Centre was design to encourage people to park alongside the many shops in New George Street and Cornwall Street. The City Centre is ‘dying’ and one way to revive this is to allow cars back in, whilst at the same time facilitating buses to travel these streets, and still allowing pedestrians’ safe routes. The City Centre needs housing in order to bring it back to life, where people are living there in the evenings. Ideally free on-street parking would be one of the best ways to bring the City Centre back to life, tinkering by increasing the current cost, would further prevent local city-wide residents from going into the City Centre at all.

**Removing maximum stay restrictions in many central off-street parking locations.** - This idea would benefit from some statistical empirical evidence one way or another, possibly through a trial. Would it be to generate more income for example, or to allow workers to park there all day, if they chose, or to bring and keep more people in the City Centre? A free bus / electric tram circulating the streets of the City Centre, where you could jump on and off as pleased, might be better, to assist getting everyone about more easily.

**Parking permits** – the cost for these should be set at the level to cover the cost of running the scheme only, as residents pay their Council Tax.

**Removing the annual visitor permits available** – No it should not be removed. Should be available to all permit holders, otherwise scheme is discriminatory.

**Increasing the cost of guest house and hotelier permits from £5 to £7 (still providing guests with a saving of £19 off the face value) and replacing paper permits with a more convenient digital system** – Set up a system which will incur minimal cost for operating this system – suggest one annual payment - all inclusive.

Simplifying off-street charges by introducing three 'bands' for car parks, with higher tariffs in the most popular and centrally located car parks such as Elphinstone, Mayflower East, St Andrews Street, North Hill and Guildhall (Band A) and better value tariffs in Bands B and C. Proposals would see short-stay prices increase and long-stay prices decrease in Bands A and B, with no changes in Band C (where the lowest tariffs apply) – Why make it so complicated? Simplify. The size of the car parking space matters – many vehicles can be vans, 4x4s, and oversized vehicles, often making neighbouring spaces unparkable. Charge more for larger car parking spaces and a standard charge for all others throughout the city, with transferable tickets, so you can move between car parks and on street parking – to encourage people to move around the City Centre bringing more life and trade. Is the collection of monies for parking intended to be profitable; or to cover maintenance cost; or loss making to breathe life into the City Centre? The costs should therefore match the strategy, be simple to use, and this should be transparent to all users.

Allowing drivers to move from a Band A car park to any other car park if they have any unused time remaining, providing more flexibility, convenience and value. Why would you have wanted to hinder parkers in the past? What was the rationale? What statistics have you got to validate the decision in this aspect? Have you explored using a camera to recognise number plates and automatically billing, for registered users?

Increasing the cost of short-stay business permits from £150 to £200 and long-stay from £300 to £400. Discounted rates will be kept as they are for NHS and health care workers, who will receive a new, dedicated health care permit replacing the discounted business permit – Why make this so complicated? Why should business customers be treated differently from residents? What is the rationale behind this strategy? Surely a long-term parking scheme for all should be available? Concessions could be built-in to be free?

Supporting local businesses by reducing the free parking period back to two hours (from three) at Mutley Barracks and Napier Street car parks, where drivers are often now parking to visit other locations, such as the city centre and university – this is as a result of poor planning decisions regarding car parking, and failure to anticipate needs (future), also evident in many streets where residents have no option but to park on pavements. Communicate with the University (5.2 not on your Consultee list) and others to establish their needs first, rather than imposing unworkable schemes for people. Make certain that a review of car parking needs for all city residents and business meets the demand, not some unworkable scheme to discourage cars, so people can park, where they need to go and for how long. Have some long-term thinking, strategies and flexibility to adapt to demand.

Tackling the issue of drivers overstaying their free parking time at district car parks (and making it difficult for other shoppers to park) by introducing a system where they must all register their session using an app or terminal. Drivers will not need to display a ticket – This again results from a poor planning strategy and needs should be reviewed. Why don't you want people to overstay and go about their life and normal business? Why choose to hinder them?

Increasing the fee of the popular Accessibility Permit (which allows blue badge holders to park for free in certain car parks) from £40 to £60 a year but expanding it to include all car parks – What is the strategy? To cover cost of running the scheme? To make a profit? To subsidise? Be clear about the strategy and charge to match.

Introducing a charge of £150 to cover the cost of installing a disabled parking space. – What is the strategy? To cover cost of running the scheme? To make a profit? To subsidise? Be clear about the strategy and charge to match.

The consultation also includes proposals to increase loading and unloading facilities for local businesses on the Barbican and restrictions to improve access and safety along Southside Street. – Again, poor past planning decisions – should have been built in from the last review. Review again to match needs.

*“We know that any price increases will be unwelcome with drivers right now but we, too, are facing tough financial challenges and we just cannot afford to keep Plymouth’s parking charges as low as they are. We hope that people will see that, as part of this review, we are proposing a range of improvements that will make parking more straightforward and convenient and support the local economy but – even more crucially – help reduce the city’s carbon footprint and address the climate emergency. I believe these are bold, green proposals.”* - It’s not just about money, it is about meeting people’s needs. Create the right strategies and the costs needed to be charged, will reveal themselves, as will any subsidies. Transparency, lack of bias, and consistency is much more important. *“help reduce the city’s carbon footprint”* Sounds more like rhetoric. Unless you improve public transport, the needs of car users will continue and increase. Do you want to revitalise the City Centre, or kill it?

*“I encourage people to share their views and help us find a solution to this issue.”* Short-term thinking is much in evidence. Plan for the long-term, otherwise you will be asking similar questions next year, the year after, and so on – not really solving the underlying issues, staying with narrow-minded thinking, as evidenced by the need to ask the above questions, all of which should have had a clearly laid out strategy backed by statistics and rationale to meet residents, visitors and business needs in 2022 and beyond.

The removal of paying for City Centre parking by cash, has meant I have already gone elsewhere for my needs, including online, as has several of my friends and family. Why do you want to keep me and others away from visiting the City Centre? This is as a direct result of your current strategy.

**Benchmarking shows Plymouth's fees are amongst the lowest available.** - Is this a valid strategy? Do we aim to be the lowest? Is this our priority? What is the Vision? What is the Mission?

What could the Parking Vision be?

*Parking in Plymouth is designed to be user friendly, welcoming, inclusive, adaptive, consistent and transparent and fair to all users, well maintained, whilst aimed at supporting long-term promotion of the City Centre and Residential areas, as a safe space to park, work, walk and play, and self-funding.*

What could the Parking related Mission be?

*Parking in Plymouth is designed with the needs of the parking public, visitors and business people foremost to revitalise, maintain and be convenient and excellent value-for-money for all.*

I’d like to comment on the proposed changes to parking within Plymouth.

It seems that systems are being put in place to increase revenue.. However, it is going to cost a fortune to implement. How much will these changes cost & how is that to be recouped.. Is this covered by the increase in charges. Why not keep this as they are & not spend that money in the first place.

Having to register when you are parking / leaving on an app.. this seems like it is going to cause a massive problem for the older generation! What if I don’t have a phone with the ability to do this?

I’m shocked at what you have proposed. We are meant to be an inclusive and welcoming city.. this is far from that!

I would like to express my dismay at the council’s intention to increase parking charges at this time.

Our city centre is dying, and we need to be encouraging people to use it.

Raising parking charges will be yet another nail in the coffin!!

This hike in charges comes as every resident is facing unprecedented increases in the cost of living! People will be unable to afford these extra costs.

I have lived in this city all my life, and would like to see it prosper as it did in my youth.

As a council tax payer, I should like to know where my tax is being spent, as services( like garden waste collections ) are being cut, and roads and pavements have been neglected, so our lovely city is starting to look like a third world country!!

Please reconsider any increase in these general parking charges, certainly for the time being.

Following the pandemic and the current unheard of cost of living rises, it's time that the council look to balance their shortfall from reserves (as any of us would have to use our savings!!), not pass the burden onto the struggling residents of Plymouth!

This council needs to put its residents first!!

I trust that you will take these views into consideration.

I write to comment on the forthcoming parking modernisation proposals.

I wish to strongly protest against the proposed rise in parking permit charges - this rise seems to punish the residents who the scheme claims to work for whilst doing nothing to deter parking in permit hours - surely a better solution would be to maintain the residents fee but increase the parking fine for those disregarding the rules and blocking residents parking.

I am also strongly against increasing parking charges in the city centre. We have a dying city shopping community as it is due to online shopping and these increases in parking charges will only deter people further ( what with the increase in petrol & energy costs ). Our public transport just isn't good enough for the local community. I feel very strongly there should be a reduction in parking charges to stimulate re growth of our city centre economy otherwise online shopping will continue to thrive and our city will further decline.

I would like to make a point on street parking in Plymouth.

Currently I am able to park using my Ringo app...Which is absolutely fine...but absolutely useless in certain instances. I work in Plymouth and my work involves visiting a lot of hospitality sites across the city. What I find frustrating is if I have a 2 hour meeting at North Hill area followed by another meeting on the Barbican but because I have used the maximum parking on North Hill and I am in the same zone I am unable to use the Ringo app again, so currently have to pay in a new parking space by cash. If you remove payment by cash how will I be able to park?

I hope this makes sense. I would be very keen to hear your views or give you more precise information.

Comments on the above where requested; therefore below are mine:

1. To retain/encourage visitors to our wonderful city, water front, Barbican and Hoe and shopping centre; don't increase parking charges, make it £1 per hour throughout 24hrs.
2. Two more park ride locations required if parking charges rise to the extortionate cost of £2 per hr. Plymstock/Sherford and west of the city.
3. One new multi-storey car park needed for city centre.

I feel very strongly that putting up parking in Plymouth will drive people away from the already floundering city centre, I agree that implementing a charge for disabled parking bays is a good idea but feel that penalising areas where residents don't have an option to choose their restrictions is very unfair

I think consideration should be taken on the increase of the Residents Permit cost from £30 - £41.

An increase of £11 is too high considering light on all other general household bills that are putting households under strain, stress and creating issues.

The resident parking makes a large profit as households usually pay 2+ cars.

There have been areas that have introduced resident parking over the past years which has in turn increased profit.

Instead:

It is noted that vehicles with less than 4 wheels is free of charge on permits - perhaps motorcycles should be charged a small fee (£10 a year) as road parked they still take up space. A small admin fee could be considered (if not already in place) to be taken for amendments to the permit - such as change of registration. A household with 2 cars is paying £60 a year as it is. (And majority households are likely 2+) At most permits to £35 (from £30) - £41 is a large increase for current struggling households - putting more strain on residents & mental health.

Dear Sir,

I write to you in response to the Council's proposal to withdraw Annual Visitor Permits from the Crownhill area, specifically Cross Park Road. My parents live in Cross Park Road.

Putting aside the huge increase in cost to the residents from currently paying £15 to the proposed £100 for the 3 books of Visitor Tickets, I would like to point out to you the difficulties that I would encounter, personally, visiting my parents with my 2 children aged 11 months and 3 years, their grandchildren, and not being able to park outside their property.

I visit my parents, bringing with me their small grandchildren, on average, 4 times a week. Multiply that by 52 and you get a total of 208 visits a year. This far exceeds the maximum 90 visits that you propose to allow using the Visitor Ticket scheme.

This would mean that I would have to park a considerable distance away from my parents' house outside the restricted zone, with a pushchair, 2 little ones and all the bags and luggage that has to accompany a visit. This is something that I would not look forward to doing, particularly in bad weather.

I can envisage a situation whereby I would not visit my parents because of the restrictions and limitations you propose. This would be detrimental in many ways to me, my parents and their grandchildren.

The car park in Crownhill Village, some might say, would be an alternative but it has a very narrow and dangerous, one-way, entrance and exit.

This makes it very difficult to use the

Pushchair while trying to keep an eye on the 3 year old. The pavement is not wide enough to accommodate the pushchair together with other pedestrians going both ways.

I urge you to think again on this matter and leave the current system in place. It has worked perfectly well for the 10 years my parents have been living in Cross Park Road.

I am writing to object to the proposal to introduce parking meters in the currently free car parks in and around the Ridgeway in Plympton. This, I feel, will have a detrimental effect on the many businesses within the Ridgeway, especially at the present time, with higher costs already starting to bite. Any loss of footfall caused by introducing parking charges, can only bring further hardship to already struggling businesses.

I write as a concerned resident to the proposal of raising the price of residents' parking permits. When the permits were first introduced they were £10. This was at a time when traffic was considerably less than today.

As a resident of Zone R, traffic has increased significantly, and coupled with the ongoing approval of HMOs in the area the parking permit fails to permit parking: to expand -

The average UK household (2022, excluding London) has 1.3 cars. The average car length is 4.4 metres long. Allowing for space between vehicles this means that each household on average requires 6.12 metres of parking.

The nature of property in zone R means that a typical home is 5.5 metres wide. This means that for approximately every 10 houses, 1 car cannot park.

If the council cannot guarantee that for £41 I can be guaranteed a place to park, as I can for the fee paid when parking in a designated parking bay, then I question what parking is being permitted for the fee.

As such I object to the proposal.

Regarding the potential plans to implement limited time parking at the Ridgeway Plympton.

These aforementioned parking areas are not in the same situation as the town orientated parking areas, the reason being patrons do not use them to visit anywhere else so are rarely abused.

<p>There is not a requirement to implement such conditions in the Plympton area and doing so I feel would have a detrimental effect on the local businesses such as the, pub's, restaurants and cafés. Its been widely seen when these sort of restrictions are implemented with new packing machines that shortly after and in due course, full charges are introduced and this is not what the residents of Plympton desire. Should this happen you would then push the attending public to seek free parking in residential areas thus causing new and unwanted parking issues in the surrounding areas.</p> <p>Taking all the above into account I would like to request no further action is taken to the parking areas in the Ridgeway Plympton vicinity. As the saying goes. If it isn't broke, don't fix it!</p>
<p>You should be proud for keeping parking charges low compared to others It's a retrograde step increasing them people just will not put up with it You will turn the hush streets into ghost towns businesses will leave</p> <p>Think again!</p>
<p>I'm mostly Ok with the suggested changes, but would like to remind you that not everyone uses a mobile phone with apps. I prefer meters that accept debit cards, particularly the variety where you just tap to pay (assuming this is secure).</p>
<p>I write as a concerned resident to the proposal of raising the price of residents' parking permits. When the permits were first introduced they were £10. This was at a time when traffic was considerably less than today.</p> <p>As a resident of Zone R, traffic has increased significantly, and coupled with the ongoing approval of HMOs in the area the parking permit fails to permit parking: to expand -</p> <p>The average UK household (2022, excluding London) has 1.3 cars. The average car length is 4.4 metres long. Allowing for space between vehicles this means that each household on average requires 6.12 metres of parking.</p> <p>The nature of property in zone R means that a typical home is 5.5 metres wide. This means that for approximately every 10 houses, 1 car cannot park.</p> <p>If the council cannot guarantee that for £41 I can be guaranteed a place to park, as I can for the fee paid when parking in a designated parking bay, then I question what parking is being permitted for the fee.</p> <p>Why should we be penalised and other areas pay nothing? An unfair system, applied at a time of extreme hardship.</p> <p>As such I object to the proposal.</p>
<p>Reference car parking charges. We will not be visiting the City Centre when prices increase. £2.00 an hour will be beyond our ability to afford to park.</p> <p>One of the reasons we try not to go to town at the moment is the cost of parking and how awful the City Centre looks. It looks like a deprived area.</p> <p>Make parking cheap or free, make the city centre attractive and people will use it.</p>
<p>Putting up parking fees is killing the city centre, but then, it is already pretty dead. Reduce bus fares and up the age that children have to pay to travel. Maybe then more parents etc. would be able to afford to take the bus rather than the car. Allow public transport to take over from private cars in the city.</p>
<p>Hello,</p> <p>With regards to the parking proposals, in my opinion and that of my family who are over 50 years old and not able to use App-based parking payment systems. Please keep the option of cash payments. Often the basic phones we have do not have sufficient working memory capacity to have the Apps, or we can't afford mobile Data packages for our phones meaning internet outside the home is not possible. Some of us have special needs and removing the cash option creates another layer of complexity thus making our everyday getting about even more of a problem.</p> <p>Please don't do this to us!</p> <p>We're not all eligible for disabled parking, we just need parking to be non-discriminatory.</p> <p>Thank you for asking for our opinions,</p>
<p>I write this in response to your planned proposal to alter the rules and regulations with regards to the parking in Cross Park Road/Way/Avenue.</p>

The last 2+years we've been living in isolation and we continue to support my father who as an elderly gentleman needs a lot of help - he visits us at least 3 times a week for food and company - we also visit him BUT in an attempt to get him out of his house and he gf be f the sofa it's better for him to come to us - are we to tell him he can only visit less than twice a week!

Many elderly people live in this area and are reliant on professional and altruistic visitors who offer physical, mental emotional and spiritual support and help this now is threatened and their anxiety levels have shot up!!

We have three children does that also mean they cannot have any visitors park in the street!!  
I'd hope you take these points into consideration

I live in a resident parking permit street with 7 - 7 restrictions, I can understand prices may need to rise however I do not agree with paying for a service we do not receive.

In Rogate Drive we rarely see a parking warden. We used to see a warden in the middle of the afternoon when the street was empty and the majority of people at work. People without permits know they are safe to park before 8 or after 6 as we have never seen wardens at those times.

Cars also park above the double yellow lines on Miller Way outside their properties in Findon Gardens with no fear of getting a ticket.

So as I said I don't mind paying for a service as long as the service is seen to being carried out.

I believe that car parking fees should not be increased. We should be encouraging people to come into the city to shop. More and more people are shopping on line and increasing charges will do nothing to help city centre shops and restaurants. We do want our city centres to survive. I also think that cash payment should be continued as, especially for older people, apps are not easy to use and you have to have a smart phone. I have found apps frustrating, time wasting and difficult to use.

Please do NOT remove the ability to pay in cash. I know several people who do not have smart phones and couldn't cope without cash I do have an iPhone but have struggled with Ringo at times

Increasing parking fees = lower footfall and less attractive shopping ( and I am one who uses the buses anyway ) but I have a frequent bus service- others don't

Thank you for the opportunity to have our say on proposed parking arrangements.

1. I am hugely opposed to removing cash payments from on-street parking.

There are surprisingly a large number of older folk who do not have credit/debit cards or the necessary apps on a mobile phone if they even have one. It is sad that older people are constantly discriminated against. Several people I know have been commented about this and how they feel marginalised

Although men nearly always have their phone on their person in one pocket or another it is not always the case for women. I don't always want to have to carry a handbag with me everywhere I go in order to pay for parking, particularly for dog walking, for example on the Hoe. I do however always have hidden cash in the car to pay for meters, supermarket trolleys or emergency situations so I don't need to carry the phone. I feel really strongly about this.

2. Although I am not totally opposed to an increase in off street charges parking charges, as agree they are cheaper than in some areas, it does worry me that city centre car parks would be on higher tariff than others. I think it could put some folk off coming into Plymouth to shop which would be bad for the economy. Also the North Hill car park is always full, often with people coming to utilise services from the adjacent businesses, eg. One of the few very busy NHS dentists in Plymouth. Residents come in from all over the city to this dentist. Maybe this car park could be dropped from the proposal as further out of the actual centre.

I trust my thoughts will be considered.

I'm old, I struggle with technology.

I have several times to use parking apps etc. and am completely baffled.

I have an old phone which I struggle with.

By removing cash in parking machines will stop me going into the city.

It has come to our attention that the availability of Free Parking for road vehicles, for up to 2 hrs in Plympton car parks, specifically that for customers to 'The Ridgeway' and associated businesses in the environs, is under threat of reduction. As Plympton residents who use these facilities many times each week, we wish to register our opposition to the reduced access to free parking at these sites and any changes which lead to a reduction in this access. This main neighbourhood shopping centre for Plympton relies on free parking to help support the range of small businesses that provide essential services to our community. This facility also supports our Health Centre, Library and local Schools which rely upon shorter term access. With the loss of Lloyds Bank this month from 'The Ridgeway', the remaining local amenities and businesses require continued support, which would not be encouraged by loss of access to free parking. It is noted that many (if not all!) supermarkets (Lidl, Aldi and Sainsbury's for example) have free parking to support their 'national' businesses. Our local Plympton community facilities, including shops and other small businesses would not have a 'level playing field' if access to free parking is removed! The result would encourage people to non-local, out-of-town shopping and business, thereby increasing road traffic to these centres. This would also increase the associated problems of congestion and emissions. Any reduction in pedestrianised footfall in 'The Ridgeway' will be detrimental to the maintenance of local facilities and businesses. Further to any loss of free parking will be an increase in on-road and side road parking together with the associated hazards. This would certainly be evident at the beginning and end of the 'school day'. Further, it has been noted that now when parking charges are introduced, payment is required, usually by smart-phone or card. These methods of payment are not available to all sections of society at all times or may not be preferred. This will further alienate and marginalise members of our community. In the current financial climate people will be forced to make difficult choices regarding their spending. The financial overheads on small businesses make their survival critically balanced and the income to PCC will rely heavily upon their continued survival.

I am emailing to object to your plan to change al parking metres to cashless. Not everyone has a smartphone, or even a debit card. I know many people who still use cash. Why should we be forced into a cashless society, which is what you will be doing? Also with putting parking charges up people will not want to go into the city. With the cost of living crisis as it is now, people will not go into the City to spend any spare money they may be lucky to have. Therefore, I can foresee many businesses closing.

I feel I must object to this outrageous proposed increase in parking charges how do you think this is relevant at Present and expecting people to pay these prices when our shops are in decline and we will be charging higher than other towns I go to Totnes and Exeter often as their shops are more varied and independent and their changes are much cheaper Shouldn't we be encouraging the public into our city centre with reasonable charges Two pounds an hour and also not being able to use cash is so wrong when a high percentage of older people still only deal in cash

We wish to strongly object to these parking proposals .The last time you tried this on the Ridgway car park it impacted on our Rd being used as an all-day parking facility as Earlsmill Rd is close to a bus stop and the Ridgway for people that work there .It is bad enough at school coming out times with parents waiting for their children.i have had to ask people to move so that I could go up my drive Yours sincerely Marcia and John Knight

With reference to future parking charges in Plymouth, I would have thought it would be an excellent enticement to people from the rest of Devon and Cornwall to choose Plymouth for shopping over Exeter and Truro.

With an ageing demographic in the South West, there is going to be more use of cars for convenience, especially for disabled people. Public transport cannot always be the answer, simply because it is often unreliable, infrequent and there's limited space for wheelchairs, walkers and invalid scooters. They vie for space with prams and pushchairs, and it's worse than ever from bus stops neater the city centre.

Surely it's better for traders in the centre to have as many potential customers as possible, and it would be better to reduce car park charges, and it would help to regenerate the city centre, which currently has far too many businesses closed down.

I realise the green lobby would rather we all cycled or walked, and those of us with health problems dearly wish we could, but government policy or not, until public transport becomes radically improved, it can't happen. So, why make things even worse during the cost of living crisis? Even more businesses will go to the wall when you price so many people out of visiting the city centre. It makes absolutely no difference what other cities charge, because their demographic could be different, their wage packets bigger and their public transport vastly better. If the difference had been less, would you have reduced our prices?

Also, another big problem for many of us will be cashless payments. Many, especially older people, do not have or want the means of paying with a smart phone. At least allow card payments, if you must, but I and many of my friends, will find it virtually impossible to use car parks if this is brought in, and at what cost to the taxpayers of changing the machines?

Please do not waste money changing things for the sake of it, especially when the council is in so much debt.

Regarding increasing car park charges, I can assure you Plymouth doesn't have the cheapest car park charges in England.

I haven't paid as little as £1.15 here in the city (your quoted average charge) for many years. I can only presume you're taking into account the odd car park which permits 1-2 hours free? Or comparing all car parks city-wide? This obviously distorts any comparison.

I do not support an increase to £2/hour in Plymouth car parks. This is excessive at a time we are all having to make savings and spend less. £1.40 which is already often the charge and is more than enough.

£2 would also be higher than many other towns/cities in the area and discourage visitors whom we sorely need to maintain and support the local economy.

I appreciate the Council is currently in debt but this is largely due to central govt. having reduced funding to local councils over many years (under a Tory govt., overtly the same political persuasion as the current local administration.) £2/hour may easily be affordable to a richer minority but not to most local people.

I use the bus when I can but there are many journeys where this is inconvenient or not viable.

Please take my views into account when considering any increase in parking fees.

Please don't remove cash as a means of paying for parking.

I strongly object to the proposal to make parking in Plymouth cashless. Removing the option to pay in cash is debilitating to parts of our society and in no way benefits the people of Plymouth that you are here to represent.

I welcome the fact that there will be no change to the Alexandra Road free car park, but please can something be done urgently to replace the ticket machine at the top end of the car park? This has been out of use for some time now, and this causes great inconvenience to users of the car park, as they have to use the machine at the bottom, which is often not working.

I wish to make the following comments in regards to the proposed amendments to parking.

1. My understanding is that a lot of parking payment apps have hidden charges, the following extract is from a recent press article - "the latest payment ruse is being carried out by the app YourParkingSpace. It is demanding an extra £1.50 for drivers who use a car park without pre-booking a space.

This is on top of a 49p 'service charge' for using the app. Some customer's say that they are finding out they have paid an extra levy only after pressing a button to make a payment on their phone.

Other pay-by-phone parking apps are also demanding extra money to use their service – with the fees taking a variety of guises.

For example, RingGo can include a 'convenience charge' of 12p on top of the normal parking tariff.

In addition, it demands up to 20p for a 'summary charge' text confirming you have paid – and a further 20p 'reminder charge' text sent ten minutes before your car park session ends, inviting you to extend your stay via your mobile.

Competitor PayByPhone also demands up to 20p for a texted 'receipt' as well as 20p for texting a 'reminder'. JustPark has a 49p 'transaction fee' for parking for less than two hours – 99p if longer.

If you are to outsource the administration of parking fees, does this not already save the council money?

2. Fully appreciate councils are underfunded, but if you are so strapped for cash, why are you spending so much money on improvements to the city centre to make it more attractive, only to then discourage people from visiting by hiking up parking charges!

3 You say you want to increase parking permits in line with inflation. My understanding is that inflation is currently running at just over 10%, yet the change from £30 to £41 would represent an increase of 36%.

You may not have increased the price of permits for many years, but where I live (zone BB) we have only had them for 2.5 years, so that's a big increase from zero!

A recent national survey has shown that doing away with card payments discriminates against elderly drivers. The elderly prefer to use cash. Not all elderly people have mobile phones and do not know how to use them for parking from my observations.

Bringing charges in line with other cities is also not appropriate. The residents of Plymouth are relatively poor compared to other big cities. Raising prices too much will deter people from using the city centre which will be detrimental to the businesses and lead to shop closures and not the vibrant city you propose!

The 'free three hours parking' in the Crownhill Village Car Park is much appreciated, but can we please have the upper Payment Machine re-instated.

It has been out of use for several weeks and the regular elderly Sunday morning users need to park in the top area.

For those with mobility problems, the second machine really is needed. At present, queues of cars often just pause beside the lower machine, blocking access to the car park, and as a regular user, I am unable walk the distance back and forth, to get a ticket.

Thank you again for the free parking time privilege in the Crownhill Village Car Park.

Having read your proposals I will simply no longer shop in Plymouth to increase something by £11 and say that's in line with inflation is madness These proposals will be the nail in the coffin for shops in Plymouth

Increase this increase that screw it lets add permits here so we can get more money while it's already a struggle, let's in courage public transport but while at it lets increase that too starts getting cheaper to get a taxi wait now let's change that too let's charge the people for this for that. You're all greedy.

Want my opinion stop looking at ways to make extortionate money and start working for the people the way the council was meant to be for, won't take long before even parking in a street you can't do anymore because you have this stupid crazy idea of permits, where is the first come first serve no you get whiny miserable people complain about everything.

I would like to see students paying a higher premium than us residents especially near the University where one house alone can have five students all with a car, and that's just one house.

I reside on Cross Park Way Crownhill and this afternoon attended a consultation into proposed changes to our permit parking scheme. We currently buy two visitors permits and no resident permit as I park my car on the driveway. Under the proposed scheme we will be restricted to only 90 visitors a year which means 275 days a year with no visitors all at a cost of £100!!!. We are against these proposals and would like to see either the permit scheme to continue as is or scrapped completely.

We don't live near the city centre or the Barbican just near a hand full of local shops in Crownhill. We feel this would be an infringement on our human rights and would make a huge

difference to our day to day living. This is totally unacceptable we live in a democracy not a dictatorship. !!!!!

This is more of a generalised comment on parking in the city for the parking modernisation proposal.

I've lived in the city centre, where there are restrictions in place, and I live further out of the city where there are no restrictions. Both have had major challenges when it comes to parking.

Whether you get people to pay for permits or not, people are going to continue to park where they can. The permit parking where I used to live didn't mean people didn't get cars. Sometimes with 3-4 cars per household, with street parking means that they take up multiple spaces when the width of their house is 1 space wide. The same is true of living in unrestricted places, and in both it's often difficult to find a space.

I agree with permits (especially electronic, where you register your number plate), but I doubt they do little to deter people from getting cars, as usually the reason for having a car is bigger than that (commuting, work, leisure etc.).

I begrudge paying for parking and if I need to go into the city centre, I'll try to group up my errands and try to do them in a short timeframe, so I can use the 2 hour parking bays, which I feel are the most reasonable thing that can be done for everyone. Increasing the number of 2/3/4 hour parking bays in the city will encourage more visitors to the city centre, especially in a time of rising costs for everyone. They can spend their money on the things they need, in the city, rather than going online. Sure, there are people that need to spend longer in the city, and I feel like that's when you could start charging, though I'd also argue that those people will be parking in Drake Circus, which is a major reason for the road improvements leading up to the car park. I also feel like the 2/3/4 hour bays would deter people who want to park their car somewhere permanently, such as in a free car park or on a road with no restrictions.

If these costs are coming into play, then the bus services need to be improved. The services need to be more regular, and the cost reduced. There are two things that could lead to people not using buses, the price and the reliability. If the bus isn't reliable, then people are going to find other means to get around. Services then get reduced in that area, but that doesn't mean there isn't a need for it, there's just an element of trust that's disappeared. The cost of an annual bus ticket is £1,250. This is the total cost of a cheap car for most, along with the insurance, tax and most of the petrol. This paired with some buses stopping services early (I'm guessing because of lack of people using the service) and lack of regular buses when needed all amount to something that isn't worth paying.

There are two things that could lead to people not using buses, the price and the reliability. If the bus isn't reliable, then people are going to find other means to get around. Services then get reduced in that area, but that doesn't mean there isn't a need for it, there's just an element of trust that's disappeared.

Ultimately, I understand we're all feeling the pinch but with these changes in place, I feel like the city centre is just going to be much quieter and more retailers will go out of business or move. Thank you for reading.

Proposed Parking charge increases will stop more people coming in to the city centre. I live in Plymstock and have tried using the bus twice first thing 0800 on a Saturday and waited over an hour so I restarted driving in. These increases will mean I will not use the City Centre as far as possible half the shops are closed anyway and this will close many more

Please could we have parking permits in Wesley Avenue?

We hereby submit our comments on your list of proposals: Our only objection is to a single proposal, however we also offer general environmental comments as well.

"Removing the annual visitor permits available in some zones to ensure a fair and consistent approach across the city"

We totally oppose this proposal. This will be an unfair and retrograde step in many areas of the central city, where (a) some residents already abuse the system by having regular groups of visiting friends take up between 2 to 5 or 6 parking spaces at a time, several times a week,

preventing genuine residents from finding space, and (b) defy the restricted-parking periods by up to 30-45 minutes due to the adherence of the Parking Patrolmen to a similar time of day for their beat. Also, (c) parking congestion - residential areas are already over-congested due to the sheer number of vehicles owned per property, and (d) how will the Council prevent non-residents from parking in our streets and then going to work, especially in areas like the University neighbourhoods? The visitor permits are essential for the old, the sick, the infirm, the lonely, and the vulnerable, to receive visits at any time from family and loved-ones.

We agree with all of the other proposals, and agree that city-parking should be better regulated, but modernised, simpler to use, and brought into line with other areas of England. In particular, we APPLAUD ANY AND ALL measures to reduce congestion and air-pollution in the central area within which housing is particularly dense.

If public comments are to be open viewing, we would be grateful to be contacted beforehand. We strongly object to charges you are looking to implement for Plympton car parks as this will ruin the shopping centre for the Ridgeway.

This is a great community where people shop and meet up regularly.

We need places like this without the worry about having to pay for car parking.

As pensioners we need our transport to take us to places such as the Ridgeway, as we live on the outskirts of Plympton and we go to the Ridgeway most days for shopping and meeting family and friends.

If you start charging for car parking, there will be a huge impact on the shops and businesses in and around the Ridgeway, and people will stop going to them.

We pay enough in council tax, we should be able to park for free in our local areas.

We hope you will reconsider these changes.

I am emailing as I am very much opposed and quite frankly appalled at the idea Plymouth City Council are proposing.

The residents of Plympton very much rely on the shops at The Ridgeway. We as residents are constantly encouraged to 'shop locally' yet this measure could discourage people and will ultimately affect and could even force our current available local services to close!

The residents of Plympton are very much a mixed bunch, with an aging population with mobility issues to young families with children who all rely on their vehicles to get around...it can take a considerable amount of time for the residents to move from shop to shop. Not only this, there are quite a few hair and beauty salons up the ridgeway, for women if you are having a colour and cut, this could take anywhere from 2-4 hours to do so. There is dance school (Starlite School of Dance) that uses the Masonic Hall and Chaddlewood Community Centre which can mean the dancers are there for many hours taking their lessons and practicing for their exams. There is the Ridgeway Methodist Church, many services are 2 hours long. There are several restaurants (The Shapla, Plympton Spice, The Stannary Court Weatherspoons etc.) When attending these eateries, usually you are with friends and with chatting can spend way longer than 2 hours. Let alone all these wonderful business owners and employees, where will they park? I really do not think Plymouth City Council have thought this through the impact this will have of the 30,000 people living in Plympton.

I appreciate you have 'made a boo boo' and have somehow gone over your budget by a mere 13.6million, but taking it out on the local residents is absolutely barbaric. You made the mistake, don't punish the residents for it.

I am disappointed in our Council.

Just wanted to voice my opposition to the parking proposals for increasing parking charges on Plymouth Hoe Please don't!

You are paid for by us the people of Plymouth via taxes- council and income - I pay an outrageous amount as it without putting up parking payments for the people of Plymouth who love our city and indeed the hoe Needs to be made more accessible not more expensive- hiding behind a green agenda - load of tosh - don't do it!

Feedback details

Your proposal of all the price increases relative to parking are disgusting. You literally do not know where to stop as a council. The most corrupt bunch of thieves this world has ever seen! Feeding the rich and killing off the poor. Not only do you allow huge businesses to continue robbing the general public for gas and electric and petrol and diesel, helping them gain enormous and disgusting profit margins but you do the same yourself. I hope someone starts an uprising and the whole city turfs out every single last one of you.

What do you think we should do

Do what you're supposed to do, help and support the general public, everyone. Not just you're pals in office and whatever company pays you the most money in back handers.

I totally disagree with the proposal to do away with cash payments for parking. Not everyone is confident with using new technology – elderly people and dyslexics for example. Just give people the choice. Cash is simple. Everything else is a hassle for many people and will result in giving Plymouth a miss for other more flexible places.

I am emailing to object to your plan to change all parking metres to cashless. Not everyone has a smartphone, or even a debit card. I know many people who still use cash. Why should we be forced into a cashless society, which is what you will be doing? Also, with putting parking charges up people will not want to go into the city. With the cost of living crisis, as it is now, people will not go into the City to spend any spare money they may be lucky to have. Therefore, I can foresee many businesses closing.

I am a disabled resident and at the moment, and am paying £40 annually to park in the City Centre, however, if the cost rises to £60 then I will not go into the city Centre.

This is in response to the above “Public consultation”. Please see below a recipe to help kill off our city centre.

1. “Virtually give away” the bus service to a private operator perhaps more concerned with “Profit” than “providing a service”

2. Hugely increase development of housing and road networks, resulting in overcrowding, delayed long slow road journey and perpetual traffic jams.

3. Penalise “easy targets” such as the most poorly and most disabled, who may be unable to use public transport and thus have no alternative but to use a car to travel.

4. To remove the option to use cash to pay for parking. This will exclude the poorest and most vulnerable in our society; not everyone has a smart phone or bank card.

5. At a time when inflation is rising at a 40+ year high, many households are already in crisis.

Significantly raising parking charges can only add to this and reduce footfall in our City Centre.

Removing the option to pay for parking with cash will also hit these poorer households unfairly; it has been shown that when money is tight, many find it easier and more efficient to budget with cash.

It was also concerning to see that on the day these “changes” went out for public consultation, a “notice of proposed order” (for these same ‘changes’) was published!

Has Plymouth City Council already decided to go ahead regardless of the outcome of this “public consultation”?

Does Plymouth City Council care more about “their budget” than the future of Plymouth City Centre?

And does Plymouth City Council care more about “their budget” than the extra misery this will inflict, especially on the most vulnerable in our society?

With reference to the proposed car parking charges at Plympton, please take this email as our objection to such a proposal. We have to take our car to the Ridgeway as we only have 4 buses a day and none on Sundays and Mondays. Most of our stops are short stays of less than an hour. We live in Newnham Close and when we arrived here in 1998 we did have a good bus service but that was eventually taken away.

The car parking charges will have a devastating effect on the Ridgeway as footfall drops, traders will leave. In a few years’ time councillors will be asking what happened to the Ridgeway.

The size of the parking spaces is too small and most people have to allow passengers to get out before they park.

To allow this to happen will be good news for the out of town supermarkets and the Ridgeway will become a ghost town. This is totally unacceptable and we strongly object.

The proposed increase in Residential parking fees is outrageous for many reasons!

1. The roads we park on are so poorly maintained it's actually a joke.
2. £30 is already ample, given the fact bringing in permits around my street was totally unnecessary in the first place. (St Leonard's road)
3. People are already struggling financially.
4. The financial struggle is set to get worse with the energy and fuel crisis.

The list goes on and on.

I completely object to this, it is taking advantage and jumping on an already crippling bandwagon!

I'd like to send my comments regarding Amd.2022.2137287 Parking Modernisation.

I completely disagree with your proposal to raise the prices both for the yearly parking permits and for the hourly parking rates. You are comparing parking prices with other cities without considering the highest wages they are getting, compared to ours. With cost of living over the roof, inflation above 10% and fuel prices remaining higher than ever before, your action should be to lower the parking fares and not increase them.

Ring Go is expensive, inefficient and unreliable and should be abandoned. There should always be a contactless option as this is quick, easy and can be used by most. I can see that removing cash payments is appealing if you wish to save money but it does further marginalise the most disadvantaged in our society.

I do not agree with the changes to parking in Plymouth (Amd.2022.2137287), at the moment people across the city are facing huge increases in other areas of regular household spending and this is absolutely the wrong time to do this!

Some members of our community may weather the rising cost of living but others will really struggle. People use the city car parks for many reasons including; work, study, shopping, and exercise and to attend events. Increasing charges at this time adds to the strain on households.

I appreciate charges do need to increase but I believe this should wait until inflation starts to fall, the council should be supporting our community during this time, you have already shown the political will to do this by freezing council tax, do this again and support our city!

As a local resident of Mutley Plain I would like to forward comments on the proposals for parking.

I agree that the council's carbon footprint needs to be addressed and this is urgent as we were all reminded by the heatwaves this summer. I do feel the council needs to consider ways of improving the local transport system (including park and ride) in order to reduce the number of cars entering Plymouth city centre. Not only will this reduce the carbon footprint but also pollution. I have 2 young children that are inhaling the pollution emitted by cars on our street on a daily basis. Cars still continue to run their engines when parked which is totally unnecessarily polluting our area.

I worry that by removing maximum stay restrictions in many central off-street parking locations this will only encourage more students to bring their cars and dump them in these areas as many of their residences are in the excluded list for parking.

I do agree with raising the price of residents' parking permits in line with inflation, from £30 to £41 a year, we would be happy to pay more (up to £85) as we are a one car family.

Would the council consider having a limit on the number of parking permits per household including HMOS that are not on the excluded list? We are a family and have chosen to use one car and then use the public transport if we can. I have spoken to many families on our street and they too have only one car. It is mainly the HMOs that have numerous cars, we live next door to a 7 bed HMO not on the excluded list so they potentially will be given 7 annual car permit.....this doesn't feel fair for us as residents and also for local people trying to park to use the businesses on Mutley Plain.

I absolutely agree with reducing the free parking period back to two hours (from three) at Mutley Barracks and Napier Street car parks, where drivers are often now parking to visit other locations, such as the city centre and university.

This is true and also what needs to be considered is that you have made it very easy for people who commute to work on Mutley Plain, they park on nearby roads for free, filling the spaces so there is not room for shoppers, then at 12 they all coming walking down the road to move their cars to the Mutley barracks and Napier street parking free for 3 hours, filling up the car parks, again no room for shoppers and the shoppers are such as they can't park on nearby roads 12-3 either. We have been stopped so many times by people frustrated they can't park in the local area between 12-3 as the car parks have been filled by the commuters. By reducing the parking back down to 2 hours it takes away the ease with which the commuters can use and abuse the system, hopefully think twice about bringing their cars to work.

Above all I do agree that fees need to be increased as a deterrent for car use and ownership. I do think the council really need to consider the improvement of local public transport and put a limit on the number of parking permits given per household to 2 as this is reasonable and would free up spaces in the area and reduce the pollution.

Re parking proposals

Please don't refuse cash. We cannot be a cashless society. Many do not have phones with apps. Please protect shops & especially independent businesses by encouraging shoppers with free parking hours or one day a week Not by increasing charges.

Responding to your request for Plymouth residents' feedback about changes to parking around the city centre, I would like to say the following:

- At a time when there is possibly the most extreme cost of living crisis in decades, can you really justify increasing parking charges by 33% (50p increase on £1.50 per hour) when inflation is currently around 10%?
- You use the justification for this increase as Plymouth being significantly below the national average for parking charges; however, average salaries and standards of living are also significantly below the national average. So, I suggest that parking charges below the national average are entirely appropriate and should remain.
- With the high street dying because of online shopping, and huge numbers of empty lots around Plymouth city centre, do you think that a 33% increase in parking charges is likely to attract shoppers back to the high street? This is not how you revitalise the high street!
- Why not start incentivising people to come to the city centre with schemes such as first hour of parking free, or make it completely free, as I understand that other towns and cities have trialled.
- Will not attracting people back to the city centre actually pay dividends in the long term, rather than a short-term, and short-sighted, strategy of increasing parking charges to raise additional revenue? Such a scheme will likely even cause a drop in parking revenues as people are put off from coming to the city centre in the first place.

I'm writing to ask why there's more parking around Devils Point for visitors than there is for people who pay for a permit who actually live here, people who come to visit are parking in permit spaces meaning we have to drive around non-stop trying to find a space, we pay for a permit to have a space but 9 times out of 10 we cannot find anywhere to actually park. Is there anything that can be done about this so residents actually have somewhere to park at all times? It's gotten a lot worse here in the last two years than it ever has been before we have old people and people with kids who would have to park 10 minutes away from their home because there's nowhere to park.

I disagree completely, the cost of parking does not reflect the prices in other areas, in Downham market it's free other areas in England are free or £1 an hour are you only talking about London, Manchester and Birmingham. We down here have lower wages with higher housing cost, higher petrol, higher food, water gas and electric so what on earth are you playing at, I for one including all my family and friends do not visit the city centre as it is due to no shops and dirty so why are you just putting a nail in the coffin. Please take note of the people you are supposed to be representing and not your greed.

I would like to object to some of your proposed parking amendments.

1. Removing cash payments - This will seriously affect a large part of the elderly population, many do not have a smart phone, many do not have a bank card with a contactless facility, they prefer to use cash, particularly if they have a limited income & need to watch every penny. Their car may be an absolute necessity, because they do not live on an accessible bus route, & the busses are so unreliable anyway. You would be causing major stress & anxiety to people who have worked hard all their lives, & many would be confined to their homes.

2. Increasing parking charges - When the majority of people are having to pay vast amounts of money for their increased fuel bills, why would you want to make it more expensive for people to go to work, the busses are very unreliable, & not everyone is near a bus route.

It will also discourage people from visiting the city centre

3. Increasing parking charges for businesses - Businesses are already struggling with fuel bills & staffing issues, why impose further pain & increase the risk of them going out of business & then we will have yet more empty shops.

4. Increasing Parking/bay charges for disabled people - many disabled/elderly people are living on a very limited income, they already pay more to heat their homes as generally they are at home all day & need to be kept warmer as they are immobile. Their fuel bills are rising exponentially, why would you want to inflict more pain on this group of vulnerable people?

I would like to comment on the increase in parking charges. I understand that there are costs that need to be covered but increasing all the parking costs included car parks and residence parking alongside all the other rising costs of living seems the wrong time.

If there are these changes, could visitor's permits be made electronic so they are more easily accessible?

Unable to attend any meetings but I believe the removal of the cash option is discriminatory, certainly for older people. Not only if the card payment fails... there have been recent reports of this in Cornwall...the choice should not be removed! So easy to park on the Bedford car park in Tavistock where there is still the option.

Clearly someone has to collect the cash from the machines, but, bit by bit the public are being stripped of choices!

We are writing to express our opposition to the following changes to the parking proposals.

1. Removal of cash payments: This doesn't offer drivers greater choice - quite the reverse.

2. Raising the cost of Residents Parking Permits: The proposed increase over 33% is unwarranted, the cost of producing and policing these permits is unlikely to have increased by this amount. Given that these permits do not actually provide any real benefit to the holders, it would seem to be being imposed purely as a means to increase income to the council.

3. Annual Visitor Permits: Surely the fair thing to do is to level up so everyone purchases books of permits at the same cost.

4. How is reducing the free parking period from 3 hrs to 2 hrs at Mutley Barracks and Napier Street supporting local businesses?

5. The issue of drivers overstaying their free parking time would presumably require the installation of CCTV cameras & NPRS, would the cost of this solution be recovered in the resultant parking fines?

6. On street parking fee increase: In these times of economic squeeze it is important that people come into the city and spend their money. Increasing parking fees discourages this!

I have some comments on the proposal to increase parking permit charges.

Unless there's actual changes to existing parking spaces for resident permit holders you shouldn't be increasing the costs. Especially when there are limited spaces already and nothing has been done to improve the situation.

People like myself, and many people in similar circumstances, aren't getting pay increases in line with inflation and it's getting more difficult. I personally cannot rely on public transport to get to and from work and have to rely on my car to do so.

I live on Hillpark Crescent (PL4 8JW) and the parking is a nightmare. Students shouldn't be allowed to have parking permits when it means full time residents cannot park. I have spoken too people in this street who live here with cars and they share similar views.

People often park here after 7pm when permit times run out and it means that people cannot park.

As I stated, unless things are done to improve services then why should costs be done to make it more expensive. Our council tax has gone up, food prices are going up, and living in general has become more expensive. Why make it more difficult by charging more for this? I know it's a one off payment but this could mean in one month the difference between a little extra credit on a prepayment key meter or having to pay out for a permit.

This leads on to my other proposal. The nearest council car park to the permit holder zone should be used as an overflow car park for when people cannot park in their own street.

Speaking of- is increasing car parking payments a good idea for business who need revenue to stay afloat? Why are we potentially putting people off parking when it could mean small businesses make sales when we having an economic downturn?

Whoever made these 'proposals' needs to go back to the drawing board because they're not the best.

I get Plymouth City Council needs to make money but with council tax going up each year, where is this money actually going? On this topic I feel an audit should be completed as public finances aren't going to the correct places. There's frequent fly tipping, drug abuse in streets around where I live, and dog affluence.

Honestly Plymouth City Council, you need to do better.

Increasing parking fees during these economically hard times is wrong and discriminates against the less well off.

I have concerns about the permit parking changes.

1. The raise in price I understand is in accordance to inflation but does that mean all streets with permit parking will be manned on a regular basis more than they are now?

I find for the money I pay to park my car is completely pointless as families have more than 1 car per household nowadays and some have a whole fleet of vehicles. I do find the parking officers are very rare to frequent the area so why am I paying £30 a year for 30 mins a year of patrolling?

2. I have a concern with the guest passes being revoked. How is this a good thing? How can you decide to hinder visiting family/friends from actually doing so? What if households require work and said tradespeople are at risk of a penalty notice?

What if when buying a new vehicle and there is a wait for the registration to change over you can't park anywhere near your property.

I feel all companies including PCC are jumping on a very dangerous bandwagon at the moment which is affecting hardworking public. Changes and price hikes are coming thick and fast from all angles but no extra incentives.

With reference to the schedule of proposals I would like to express support for most aspects in particular the modernisation of processes and the adoption of the likes of Apple Pay for payment – transactional methods have moved in this direction and we are very much behind in reflecting this.

Strand Street / Cremyll Street

I would also kindly request the committee review the usage of the "Strand Street / Cremyll Street" car Park. It is a free car park but without restrictions on stay. Hence it is frequently full and not able to service the needs of businesses, visitors, tourism and the usual visitations one will expect in such an area. It is extremely busy and, to be honest, used as permanent storage for vehicles such as motorhomes, vans and suchlike.

A scheme where 24-hour parking could be prohibited would benefit the area.

Zone T – Supporting the needs of SMEs

I also kindly request the committee review the adequacy of "Zone T". When we took up premises in the area, some 3 years ago, it was the case that small businesses resident in Zone T were able to apply for a small number of parking permits to support business operations and light staffing.

This is no longer the case, and inhibits business operations, particularly (coupled with the issues with the Cremyll Street/Strand Street car park) where we need to accommodate client visits. The ability to purchase a small number of permits, albeit at a higher business fee perhaps, would be immensely beneficial at supporting the ability of SMEs in the area to do business. Also, the ability to purchase shorter daily visitor permits for businesses resident in Zone T would also support business operations – particularly SMEs. Thank you for your consideration of the above thoughts, and I look forward to reading an update soon

I'd like to propose more availability of parking for bicycles. Currently there are very few secure bicycle lockers. I, for one, would be more inclined to cycle to the City Centre if I knew my bicycle wasn't visible to the public and left vulnerable.

You're increasing payments with no better public transport. You want people to use the buses but they are shocking, expensive and there are not enough. We do not have the wealth of other cities and to increase these fees with the cost of living is deplorable. The council have already cut services, garden waste and pavement spraying for weeds etc. What exactly do we pay for???

1 or 2 hours should be free in the city centre, cash at machines should be standard along with using card. Cash is still legal tender so why is it not acceptable for PCC?

In a minute you'll need to be repairing the roads and pavements because all the weeds have damaged them. Get back to basics, look after the little things that build up to cause big problems, that'll save you money in the long run.

While I'm at it, if you're so worried about climate change stop making me drive across the city to use chelson meadow when Weston mill is closer. Emissions, wear and tear on my vehicle and the road all play a part.

My issue with PCC is that you're hypocritical, you cannot make up mind what you want. Our city is fabulous but you make it hard to show it in the best light.

I would like to place on record my objections to the proposed changes to parking in District Centre car parks, namely The Ridgeway Plympton. The allocation of two free hours which is to be monitored by the installation of machines in the car parks and which I understand are easily adjusted could in fact after a period of time be stopped and all car parks become chargeable. The fact that these machines all over the council owned car parks will be cashless and involve mobile phone apps. Or debit/credit card payment in advance will probably result in users overpaying as they will be concerned not to incur penalties by running out of time.

The Local Plan for Plympton specifically included the provision of free car parking and should be honoured in its full meaning. People wishing to stay longer than the allocated two hours will choose to use on-street parking in residential areas as well as the car parks at Harewood House and the sports clubs to the detriment of the users of these vital community facilities. Should the council then decide that there is no free parking the effect on the businesses in The Ridgeway and surrounding areas will be catastrophic?

Whilst I understand that the council needs to make up a budget shortfall of over £13 million please do not penalise the general public. The comments in your proposal about Plymouth having cheaper parking costs than other cities does not seem to take into account that the wages of the car park users are also less than in other cities. I also fail to see how using a debit/credit card or mobile phone as opposed to cash reduces the city's carbon footprint.

I sincerely hope that you will reconsider some if not all of these changes.

I note you say you want to increase the choice of methods to pay for parking, yet also say that you wish to remove the option for cash payments.

Last week I tried to park in the guildhall car park, but was unable to pay. I had a choice, risk getting a ticket or leave. No wonder the city centre is dying.

Thank you for putting this information out on the proposed changes to parking management.

Clearly, the Council must consider how to increase income in response to high inflation. However, I have always considered Plymouth to be an expensive city for car users. As a city that depends to some extent on visitors, that is not good. I also resent the additional payments for online parking fees – the council (and others) lower costs by going online and there should be no additional charge.

When I first came to Plymouth over 40 years ago (attending a job interview which overran by a full hour) I was 15 minutes late getting back to my car and found a parking ticket on my windscreen. Welcome to Plymouth! It didn't form a good impression.

I love my adopted city and married a Plymouth girl – but it is not the friendliest place for drivers, and I see that as a constraint on business. That needs to be carefully considered.

Thank you for consulting.

Putting up charges for parking in line with the rest of the country .is another nail in are coffin we are not in the same pay scale as the rest of the country. .there are still people who can only get by with cash for their parking are we not allowed to park anymore a bit of discrimination there. .blue badge holders are being driven out of town. Or being screwed. People are leaving the city centre because it's filthy instead if all these proposed upgrades (waste of our money) just power hose the whole place clean from pigeon shit act and dirty buildings

Has anybody thought about increasing the level of fast/rapid charging for EVs in and around the city? I've heard a large GridServe station has been approved on Outland road. This would be popular with passing tourists on the A38 (although I can't imagine it'd improve congestion) but what about installing more smaller facilities at destination car parks such as supermarkets, cinemas etc. throughout the city.

Are there rapid chargers at the park and ride stops? Are they advertised as being available at the park and ride? Generally people use the park and ride for at least an hour which would be more than long enough for rapid/fast chargers. For people wanting to stay longer, the 7kW chargers would be adequate and these are easier to install as they're the same capacity as those used at homes. Increasing use of park and ride by whatever means would help reduce congestion and also improve the councils green credentials. As the park and rides are generally on or very near arterial roads at the outskirts you'd also catch tourists passing the city by. If the charges/contracts/leases are set correctly the city could also make some money from them?

I wish to object to the proposed increase in parking charges in Plymouth City Centre. Whilst it is true that Plymothians probably enjoy lower parking fees than in most parts of the country, one would argue whether the quality of what's on offer compares to other cities in the country. Indeed the very act of increasing parking charges will have a detrimental effect on trade in the City Centre and the businesses that operate from there.

Shopping centres such as Plymstock and Plympton have managed to survive the pandemic and remain thriving shopping centres due to the fact that they offer free parking.

Please, I urge you to consider the negative effect that this course of action will have on the local economy.

I am making some general representations about your proposals.

Whilst I understand the financial challenges faced by Plymouth City Council, that same body needs to remember the financial challenges being faced by its residents and businesses. The current proposals pass on the vast majority of the burden onto residents.

Residents and indeed visitors only have finite resources and your proposals will mean they have less money to spend whilst in Plymouth. Businesses already struggling could see further negative impact on their income, this could be the difference between survival and cessation of business. Without these businesses why would people want to come to the city centre. I fear most for small hospitality type businesses and small independent shops who don't have the luxury of sharing costs etc. amongst a national chain.

I am particularly concerned about proposals to extend the times of payable on street parking, at the same time as putting hourly charges up to £2ph. As an example when attending the theatre or having a city centre evening meal we park after 18:00 on the road leading up to the hoe from Elphinstone car park. This tends to be relatively empty especially out of season. Your proposals

would mean us paying £8 per visit or the fee for Elphinstone car park. This would mean for us less trips to such venues and a consequential loss of income for such venues.

Is it seriously your idea that such trips should be the prerogative of the better off?

We use Elphinstone car park when we come into Plymouth and pay £3.50 for six hours. We can then undertake our shopping, have a coffee and possibly lunch. The proposed increase will mean us undertaking less trips and potentially buying online, small businesses again take the hit for your charges.

You might say use the bus but at nearly £15 return for the three of us that is not affordable. It is not much more for a taxi but your more recent policy changes have increased their costs and Brexit meant less drivers so less taxis. We can't go by taxi for an evening for the fear of not getting home.

My last point concerns the removal of cash options. I believe it is totally unfair to exclude people who either don't have a smartphone for apps or don't have a mobile to make calls or in some cases don't want to use cards but prefer cash. I know this is a minority of people but should they be excluded from being able to park!

I honestly believe these comments are a waste of time as you are just ticking boxes and have made your minds up but I feel strongly about the future of the small businesses in the City Centre.

I would like to register my disapproval of the proposal to charge for car parking in and around the Ridgeway car parks.

This will have a huge detrimental effect on footfall and therefore trading capacity for all of the traders and drive more people to use the supermarkets where parking is free.

In your newsletter the council firstly sets out its vision to invite more people into Plymouth City Centre with the expensive works to be carried out on the City Centre and in particular Armada Way. Then it separately advises of the changes to Car Parking policies.

I am of the generation (aged early 60's) who have seen many changes to our lovely City Centre. I travelled into the City Centre for School and then work from 1970 until 2017 and have seen the gradual decline of the centre. When I first started going in traffic could travel in New George Street, Cornwall Street and Armada Way as well as many other roads. Quite rightly it was then pedestrianised which made the Centre more inviting and safer to move around. I used to boast too many people outside of Plymouth that we had a great centre to visit and indeed many people outside of Plymouth told me that we had a centre they wanted to visit. Then in the name of modernisation it was all torn apart with the destruction of Drake Circus and the building of The Mall. Anyone with a modicum of sense would have foreseen that the city centre would be broken into 3 with 1) The Mall, 2) Top half of town and 3) The Bottom half of town. This quickly happened and the demise of Woolworths, Littlewoods and Derry's (Co-op) did not help but clearly the Bottom Half became an almost dead zone to be filled with 'cheap' shops and moving the Main Post Office into Smiths did not help the situation as Smiths is also struggling which can easily be seen by lack of footfall and extremely tired appearance.

The top half of town struggles to hang on and the Half Baked Improvements which has left it looking like a bomb site are a disgrace and for a long time there have been many reported struggles to keep the Mall fully occupied, it is clear that it is dying like the rest of the centre... if that was the council's aim, Well Done! You are succeeding!!

How do you try to arrest this position? By making it more difficult for shoppers to park! I know that Covid made people wary of handling cash and the younger generations have embraced their mobile phone technology massively and cannot live without them but there are still loads of people who are more wary of technology and certainly do not trust things like contactless cards or having to use a smartphone for everything. I and many others do not have contactless cards or use smartphone technology, we do use pin & chip in supermarkets and always look to use cash in a carpark or public transport. I would also suggest that whilst the Centre has become a student area which does not use cash, they are already in the centre, the people you want to encourage into the centre are the middle aged/ older generation and I can assure you that if you cannot pay for the expensive by cash, we will be avoiding the centre as much as possible, which will not help

the cause of increasing footfall into the centre and make the retailers less likely to open up there. Everything you are proposing and Doing is driving everyone out of the centre to new retail parks / offices in the outskirts of the City.

I therefore urge you on a personal level and on a business level of keeping the City Centre alive and not just a student area, to reconsider your parking plans.

Plympton St Mary Neighbourhood Forum strongly object to the implementation of measures to introduce parking controls in the car parks within Ridgeway area.

When our Neighbourhood plan was written and subsequently made in May 2019, the Forum consulted with both local businesses and residents prior to its compilation and their views were taken into consideration.

In the Section of our Plan headed "Economy" under PSM6 Ridgeway Shopping it reads "Free and good parking facilities are key to the success of the established retail and employment areas of Plympton St Mary and something both residents and businesses wish to continue and support." "In the same section - Community Action EC4 "to support proposals for the continuation and expansion of free, short and long term parking to meet the needs of local businesses."

In the area adjacent to Ridgeway is Harewood House, Plympton Library, and a variety of Sports facilities. Tennis, Bowls, Cricket, Swimming and just pure recreation for all. Harewood House is an integral part of our Community and provides facilities for the Health and Wellbeing for all. Several groups and associations use Harewood House for exercise, social meetings, educational classes etc. which caters for all ages and abilities. Every weekday there is a "Coffee Bar" run by local groups. This Coffee Bar is used by many as a means of making contact socially but also provides a "meal" at a very reasonable cost for everyone. Many stay from 10 until it closes at 2. The parking around the Harewood area at present is very limited and if utilised by those who would not want to be restricted by time, then users of Harewood Park with all its sports Clubs, Harewood House and the Library will be penalised.

I wish to make a representation, mainly regarding residential parking and the costing. I live in Knighton Road. We were asked to complete a consultation on the permit parking earlier in the year regarding timing and restrictions to which we still do not know the outcome. Are you able to enlighten me?!

I strongly oppose the price increase especially when a lot of the time we can't even park in our road which we pay permits for. This is especially a problem at weekends (when no permit is valid) People park here to go to town, the hoe or barbican!

Maybe before you consider increasing any charges, you should think about just increasing everyone's by a reasonable amount such as £5 a year and not the amounts you have indicated depending on the car you have. A lot of people will be penalised for their car. Which is no fault of their own, especially in today's climate will they may not be able to afford a different car!

Please give regard to the people who actually live in the area and make the permit parking 7 days a week from 8-4 for example to give us a chance to be able to park by our houses for a change.

Increasing the price of residents' parking permits from £30 to £41 not acceptable, particularly at a time when the cost of living has risen astronomically and most people have not had wage increases to accommodate this increase. I can say for myself that I have not had a wage increase for more than four years.

The council will have made savings with the resident parking permit scheme by changing to a digital parking permit, so administration, postage and material costs have reduced.

I also feel that increasing the on street parking charges will discourage people from coming to the city centre for shopping, social, and leisure reasons which will in turn have a negative impact on our local economy. I do not feel that this is a way to support struggling local businesses. The city centre already looks run down with so many empty stores.

It is well known that Plymouth City Council is having to address the projected budgetary overspend, but I do not feel it is right to pass this on to the local population at this time.

I am writing to respond to one part of the proposed changes for parking in particular.

I note that at the bottom of the list of planned changes is "Introducing a charge of £150 to cover the cost of installing a disabled parking space."

I feel this part of the plan disproportionately affects people with disabilities and may be discriminatory.

People with disabilities who might require a disabled parking space are already some of those most affected by the current cost of living crisis and so charging them to install a parking space that they require in order to be able to safely mobilise from vehicle to home is inappropriate. I do not have or require such a parking space, nor does anyone in my household. I would feel very aggrieved if I found out that a neighbour or colleague with a mobility problem was expected to pay a considerable sum in order to maintain their independence in this way.

Please reconsider this part of the plan, and if you intend to go ahead, be prepared to share publicly the EIA I'm sure you have completed.

The proposal to alter the district parking will I feel be costly for the authority. Not everyone has access to an app to register their car. This will require terminals to be fitted to the car parks giving a cost increase for installation and maintenance, not to mention how this will be policed. In some towns and shopping areas there is a free period of an hour or two for parking, allowing shoppers to make a quick visit. The minimum fee of two hours is also off putting in the city centre.

These proposals will encourage people to use out of town shopping areas rather than increase the shopping expenditure by going into Plymouth city centre.

May I please protest about the proposed idea of putting parking machines in the Ridgeway Car Park.

This would just about put the last nail in the coffin of the Plympton Ridgeway. Our local shopping centre is just about done with the closing of Lloyd's bank this week. I feel once machines are placed in the car park the next step would be to start charging and this would definitely be the end!

Plymouth City Council have successfully killed the city centre off and since they absorbed Plympton in 1967 are seem to be intent in doing the same here.

I believe the government's view on parking charges, which has not changed, is that they should be no greater than the sum needed to cover the administration and other costs directly related to parking. They shouldn't be another revenue raiser to swell the coffers of the council.

I am writing in respect of the proposed increases in car parking charges currently being considered for Plymouth. For the avoidance of doubt this is a letter setting out reasons for objecting to any proposals for an increase in car parking charges in Plymouth. In fact I believe that it is the very opposite that should be considered in order to prevent; further loss of trading, loss of more retailers and further reduction in visitor spending in the community which will contribute to the continuing decline in the City's attractiveness.

The following is a list of reasons that I believe support my belief that to increase car parking charges would be unconscionable and should therefore not be raised:

Firstly, on reading some time ago that the reason for the increase is that the current hourly charge in Plymouth was in the order of 50p per hour lower than other areas or City's, I immediately reacted with the thought that the hourly rate for many working people who live in and around Plymouth is less than many other cities. Also noting that Plymouth has a significant number of retired people who are on small pensions and who sometimes use the City car parks. Secondly, loss of small and large Companies are suffering from low footfall and need schemes that encourage more customers. Car parking charges are a major consideration when deciding where to shop and therefore affect how many people travel into the City. I feel I am stating the obvious here but I am invited to make my reasonable comments.

Thirdly, I believe that any increase in charges would be unreasonable in the current climate of energy price rises. The added cost of car parking increases would add more to what is forecast as the heaviest increase in energy costs for many years.

Fourthly, any increase would serve to add to inflation which already stands at 10%. Therefore the burden would fall to people who are already struggling with steeply rising costs. It surely cannot have escaped the thoughts and minds of the decision makers in respect of this issue that by increasing costs inflation will continue to rise.

The following extract from the Plymouth Live article (dated 17 August) claims a number of points: “We hope that people will see that, as part of this review, we are proposing a range of improvements that will make parking more straightforward and convenient and support the local economy but – even more crucially – help reduce the city’s carbon footprint and address the climate emergency. I believe these are bold, green proposals”. With the possible exception of “Removing maximum stay restrictions” I do not view any of the proposals as “improvements” any benefit to “straightforward and convenient” will be at a cost, it will certainly not “support the local economy” and to claim that it will “help reduce the city’s carbon footprint and address the climate emergency” is a claim that would be difficult to measure. Making the cost of parking more expensive for people who have no other option but to use their vehicle to visit the city will not prevent the use of the vehicle, giving people the choice to use public transport as an alternative may go some way to help reduce the climate emergency. Where is the evidence to support the claim that putting up car parking charges to “help reduce the city’s carbon footprint and address the climate emergency” could be regarded as: “bold, green proposals”.

I also consider that the 50% increase being considered for blue badge holders is unconscionable, why should any person or group have such a burden handed to them. I read an article in the Plymouth Herald (24 August) that highlighted this unacceptable proposed rise in the charge for blue badge holders, the contributor of that article made it clear that rather than renew their concession, if the new price is adopted, they would seek another shopping centre. If others do the same the increases would not only result in an overall revenue decrease but would also result in a loss in revenue to City Centre traders. Plymouth cannot afford such continuing decline to its business community.

I do not believe car parking charge increases will help the future sustainability of the business community, and therefore the community as a whole.

I read with interest the “Fun and Fountains plan for the City Centre” Plymouth Herald 20 August. Is there a business case for this “Urban Park”, no I’m not against it, I just do not comprehend a decision (involving increasing parking charges) that will surely adversely affect footfall being consistent with an expensive scheme to encourage an increase in footfall. The article in the Herald alludes to “years of under-investment in city centre streets and spaces”. Any business case should surely take into account the conflict between the detrimental effects that increasing car parking charges will have compared to the anticipated benefit that an “Urban Park” would have. The final paragraph of the Herald article reads: “If we are serious about encouraging investment and people back into the city to live as well as work and shop, we need to make it more attractive”. I agree wholeheartedly with the latter, so one way to prove being serious is to refrain from the detrimental effect that increasing parking charges would have.

Regeneration of the City Centre will not be achieved by increasing parking charges.

I would appreciate if the above could be considered as reasonable and justified reasons for not increasing car parking charges, and the proposal rejected.

Should you wish further comment or ideas please do not hesitate to contact me.

This surely is not the time to be penalising hard pressed residence by what is in effect free money for the council. Of your reasons for increasing charges the only one that is barely legitimate in these difficult times is trying to reduce carbon emissions. But that doesn’t stand up for residents who buy permits and park their car near their home and cycle, walk or use the bus which many do. The reason given to bring charges in line with other councils is poor in the extreme. How about bringing charges in line with those who charge less. Give hard pressed council tax payers a break and a helping hand and shelve this unnecessary increase on their budgets, no matter how small and show them a sympathetic side of the council in these extremely difficult times. The kudos you will gain from that will far outweigh the financial gain to the council and will not make any difference to climate change.

Whilst I have no objection to the proposed increased cost of resident permits, I should like to see some limit placed on the number of permits issued, together with stiffer penalties for those who repeatedly contravene restrictions.

In my street (Hillside Avenue, Mutley) we have a household of two tenants with six vehicles that are each used in connection with their business. Several of those vehicles are driven by their employees, and each has been parked in the permit bay during the hours when restrictions apply. To my knowledge, permits have been issued for three of those six vehicles.

I should like there to be a limit on permits issued per household; I believe two is quite adequate. I also believe that the vehicles in question should not be driven by anyone other than the registered keeper. In other words, those vehicles should not be driven by non-resident employees of local residents who happen to be running business operations.

I should also like to suggest that permit holders who repeatedly contravene restrictions, whether by parking vehicles in the permit zone without a permit, or parking on double yellow lines, are dealt with by forfeiture of all permits in issue to them.

1) Raising these is a good idea. Folk who can afford a vehicle can afford to pay to park

2) Carrying small change to allow any amount into the machines has become a habit

Not a problem. Using electronic devices would defeat me.

Please may I have a telephone number for this facility, as I often wish to improve the traffic flow, and have traffic lights which are faulty report? Thank you.

I am writing to you to express my concern about increasing in parking charges. As I'm sure you're aware, we are in a coat of living crisis and people are struggling now more than ever to put food on the table. The increase in charges for parking may not seem like much, but they will increase social isolation for those living in adverse poverty and will create difficulty for those who are working to make ends meet.

It is difficult enough being student in Plymouth who is not allowed to park outside of my own home due to resident permit restrictions, but to now have to pay more for parking during restricted hours and when doing shopping in the city centre would be something which would create a great deal of difficulty for me and my partner (and many others in my building)

I write to give my representations to the proposed changes concerning the visitor annual permit scheme

Preamble

Firstly, I do not think placing notices on a few lampposts in the middle of August to be adequate to bring the proposed changes to the attention of all the residents of Cross Park who would be affected by the changes.

Secondly, the list of proposals contained in the Council's email, Plymouth News, of 19 August just states: ...'Removing the annual visitor permits in some zones ...' without stating which zones, nor which zones are not having their annual visitor permits removed. It would of course be possible to bring the zones which already have 'books' of 30 permits to be brought in line with the annual visitor permit system and not the other way round.

Thirdly, neither of the above guarantees that everyone affected will have received this bad news. (There was a time when residents would have been informed by letter and a meeting held with the local councillors to discuss such proposals).

Fourthly, James Stoneman has kindly arranged a hasty meeting on 31 August 2.00–

5.00 pm at a time when some residents, particularly those with school-aged children, are away on holiday and others may be at work. This is of course a result of the short notice given of the timetable for receipt of representations. The only notice I have seen of this meeting has been through the Cross Park Residents Facebook group and not all residents belong to this group.

My Representations

I. Very few streets in the 'suburbs' have any restrictions at all, including the next road over, Great Berry Road. Those inhabitants can have as many visitors as they like and indeed anyone can park there freely by day and night. I understand why the resident and visitor permit scheme for Cross Park came about (I was here at the time) but not why we should have the present system changed. If the Council want to make more money, why not bring in the same system for the whole city, then we would all be equal? Parking is difficult just about everywhere given the increasing number and size of cars. How much extra money do the Council think it will receive from the proposed changes in Cross Park?

2. The worst thing of all is that the number of visitors being allowed to park here is to be rationed i.e. limited to 90 per year (and this at a cost of c. £100 on top of the resident permit fee of £41 when most Plymouth inhabitants pay nothing – this at a time when we are all worried about the rapidly rising cost of energy etc.).

3. I have someone to help with my garden. This would account for one book of 30. If at some point I wanted a bit of help with the housework this would take another 50, leaving 10 for family and friends, let alone people such as plumbers, builders, and electricians etc. who do not have city-wide business permits. If someone were to visit for even 10 minutes that is one permit gone.

4. There will of course be some who are not affected as they have paved frontages of a size for 2-3 cars to park. Others may not have or need many day-time visitors but please see the paragraphs below – circumstances can change over the years.

5. The following points relate to the elderly (of which I am one), people who are at home during the day as a result of retirement, illness, particularly those living alone, looking after children etc. This is discrimination against them.

6. People living on their own had no visitors during lockdown - for good reason. It was worse for those shielding. Phone calls are a poor substitute for human contact but most of us got by. However there are people who are lonely, both young and old, perhaps depressed, who need regular visits and do not meet the requirement for an 'essential visitor permit'. Now the Council are proposing to isolate us again to a certain extent by rationing the number of visitors and taking away our freedom to have visitors at any time. What happens when the 90 permits have been used? No visitors or tradespeople? And please do not say they should come by bus. Elderly people tend to have elderly visitors and it is a long walk from the bus stop, especially if you t waiting for a hip replacement. Also not every visitor lives in Plymouth. My relatives, for example, all live at a distance. The same applies to evenings when anyone can park – a lot of people do not like coming out in the evening or having visitors at that time.

7. If this proposal goes through (and I very much hope it will not) I have the following choices:  
Either

Have the whole of my front garden paved over to accommodate my visitors – and this high cost may not be affordable, particularly in view of the heights to which energy prices are heading. Also this is not very environmentally friendly.

or

Ask my visitors to park in Great Berry Road or the roads off it. Tradesmen would not be happy with that.

or

Move to live where there are no restrictions whatsoever. However, this new system Could make it difficult to sell.

I appeal to your humanity. Two of the councillors are very young. How would you feel if you could not visit your elderly relations because they had run out of visitor permits or you were restricted in having visitors in the same way? You may not be bothered now but we are all ageing.

Plymouth, PL1 3BJ

I have to say that I am very angry about the proposed increase in resident parking permits for zones such as mine (Zone R).

The reason for my anger is as follows:

We have restricted parking between noon and 3pm every day except Sunday. As a working family, this is practically useless to us. We leave at 7-7:30 am and return 5-5:30 pm, Monday to Friday. The restricted parking time is basically useless to us, those who have to pay - but if we do not pay this fee we cannot park outside our house on Saturdays between noon and 3pm

Heaven forbid we try to drive away from our house on a Saturday with the intention to return after 3pm. If we do so, our spaces get taken by people who can then park for free until Monday noon, leaving us often with difficult, if not impossible parking.

During the week, our spaces are used at home-time by people picking up from the local school - who of course do not have to pay anything for the privilege - giving us problems parking. What is the point of resident parking permits if not to protect the spaces for residents at the times they need to use them?

We have raised this issue before, when our zone was protected from 8-10am Monday to Saturday - but your response was to change it to noon to 3pm (which is worse from our point of view) - so we get the feeling that you have no intention to work in favour of the residents (those who pay), but for some strange reason you would rather make things easier for those who do not have to pay for resident parking permits.

Increasing the price of the parking permits simply adds salt to this already gaping wound. I would be happy to see spaces in my zone taken by someone who pays (even during the restricted times), so adding metered parking in my zone would at least be equitable - the ones who want to park outside my house when I cannot, can pay for the privilege. However, what would be far preferable would be to have my zone protected at the times I need to use it. 5-8pm (instead of noon to 3pm) would be a far better option than the current one - at least we could expect a reasonable chance to park nearby after working hard to earn money to pay our council tax.

I suppose that parking permits are the same price for other zones where all day parking is restricted? That seems very unfair - why should I pay the same rate for only 3 hours if someone in another zone gets 8, 12 or even 24 hours for the same price?

It's high time you put in place a resident-centric policy for parking permits.

Hi, your proposed increase in parking charges will finish the shops in the city centre all you will do is drive people to the out of town shopping centres where they can park for free, very short sighted, you cannot continue to milk the motorist.

People are already struggling with the rise in petrol, diesel, heating, cooking and overall cost of living. If you increase charges now you run the risk of making people more isolated and vulnerable. Mental health issues are huge in the city and are on the increase.

Plymouth Council has already made savings by stopping the garden waste and 'no mow' May, June, July and August. I have never seen Plymouth look such a mess as it does at the moment. To increase charges now is going to push some people over the edge.

Also to remove the option of paying by cash is not helpful not everyone is able to pay by card in particular the older generation will struggle.

I understand the need to increase revenue for the council and that parking charges have been largely left as is for several years. However I think to increase the costs now with the current cost of living would be counterproductive as it could cause people to lose their jobs if they can't afford the extra charges and cause shoppers to not go into town which is already seeing a footfall shortfall over the past decade. Which will cause traders and chains to potentially lay off staff due to the decreased revenue to those stores and traders. I personally would support an increase in parking charges once this living crisis is under control and an extra street sweeper sent out once a week to make sure parking spaces and car parks are kept clean. I believe the general public would be willing to pay the extra if they saw that the upkeep of these spaces and car parks were being improved. The revenue created from extra charge to parking would pay for an extra street sweeper once a week and have money left over to go into other departments pots as well.

The perfect way to stop people spending money in the city centre and Barbican area let alone Mutley. Footfall will decrease. Short term, shocking decision.

I'm not against an increase in parking charges across the city, however I am concerned that you are preventing those with lower incomes from entering the city by increasing the cost of parking vehicles they have already paid for without offering to reduce the cost of public transport.

Additionally, you don't explain what's actually going to be done with the fees you're collecting from parking space users. Yes, you talk about Plymouth's nebulous and opaque plan to become 'carbon neutral' but charging more money for parking spaces you know full-well people are going to use anyway doesn't help you to achieve this goal.

There is an additionally problem, as there are only two alternatives to taking a car into Plymouth and they're both unappealing:

1. Take public transport: Public transport costs in the UK are unreasonably high, especially when you consider the poor condition of our buses and unreliability of their service. Too often have I had to collect friends who have been left by last-minute cancelled services with no warning from Plymouth City Bus.
2. Cycle: Cycling in Plymouth is terrifying for new riders, and all but the newest road infrastructure is extremely cycle-unfriendly not only because other road users cannot be trusted to drive safely around cyclists, but the poor road conditions on most roads except main roads is also discouraging.

I have the following questions for you:

1. When you've increased the price of parking, permits, etc., where is this money going to go?
2. How will you improve cycling infrastructure across the city to encourage truly green transport into the city?
3. How much will you be lowering Plymouth City Bus prices by in order to make up for the increase in private vehicle parking costs and therefore encourage public transport use?

So at a time when people have been unprecedentedly financially attacked from every angle you decide to increase charges on everything. Often at well above the already crazy inflation rates eg parking up to £2 an hour is a 33% price rise, 3 times that of inflation. These proposals are also entirely discriminatory particularly to the older generations who don't have or want smart phones and are not aware how to use things like Apple Pay. Also why should people who live in permit zones not be allowed guest permits so they can have guests in their home the same as everyone else?

All in all I think every proposal is awful and could not be at a worse time for an already financially struggling society!

I would like to object to Residents parking increasing.

Why should we be penalised for living near the city centre, surely we should have incentives. People who live further out do not have to pay for parking outside their houses. We also are not guaranteed a space.

I know and realise my letter will not make the slightest of difference, as money rules and penalise whoever stands in the way.

With anticipation?

I welcome the fact that there will be no change to the Alexandra Road Crownhill free car park, but please can something be done urgently to replace the ticket machine at the top end of the car park? This has been out of use for some time now, and this causes great inconvenience to users of the car park, as they have to use the machine at the bottom, which is often not working.

I live in one of the roads where we pay the parking charges. To me I think you are being very unfair. We pay this sum each year all we get is just 1hr 5 days a week to park which leaves it to any other car to use 23 hrs a day free of any charge so we pay for everyone to park here for free. you class this as resident parking why are we not able to park in the road where we live and most times we are not able to do this .we are not getting the residents parking that you are asking us to pay if we pay residents parking then that is what we should get .as for expecting us to pay more when we don't get a decent service from you now .we need free parking like everyone else or pay for residents only parking

My only comment is to please give us an alternative to RingGo or phoning at all parking machines. Ideally I would like cash to still be available but I can cope with using a credit card if necessary.

I would like to register that I think paying on leaving a car park is preferable to pay on arrival, when you don't necessarily know how long you will want. If charges are increasing people are more likely to want to pay for the minimum they may require, which may mean that they leave earlier than they might if they could decide at the end of a visit. Businesses may miss out on revenue if customers decide to rush back to their car, rather than continue shopping or have a pudding in a restaurant.

I also wonder whether some car parks could have a floor with wider spaces for larger vehicles, which could be charged at a higher rate. Some people may prefer to pay more for peace of mind that their car is less likely to be knocked by another's door and may be less inclined to use parent and child spaces when they don't need them. As the owner of a small car, I don't come into this category but I've noticed that some cars barely have room to open the door.

I write to comment on the forthcoming parking modernisation proposals.  
I wish to strongly protest against the proposed rise in parking permit charges - this rise seems to punish the residents who the scheme claims to work for whilst doing nothing to deter parking in permit hours - surely a better solution would be to maintain the residents fee but increase the parking fine for those disregarding the rules and blocking residents parking.

I would like to voice my concern regarding the idea of adding a parking charge to our free carparks.

I DISAGREE with this because of the following

- The council say they support small businesses and local highstreets, but this will KILL our Highstreet and the businesses within it.
- Local residential streets will be highly impacted by shoppers avoiding parking in chargeable carparks and find free areas to park.
- Plympton is one of the most bustling local highstreets in the county that offers a wide selection of products from people that work extremely hard to ensure their own businesses thrive/survive.
- Local businesses on the Highstreet support the cottage industry, local farmers and other local suppliers who would also be impacted if this was to go ahead.
- There will be local job losses in the community
- Charging for the local Highstreet will push people to the main supermarkets that do not charge for car parking, therefore putting money in to the pockets of large retail chains rather than supporting the local people of Plympton.
- People that own and work in the businesses along with customers will have to pay daily parking which is unaffordable generally, but even more so in the current climate.
- Why is this even being considered when people are struggling to heat their houses and buy food.
- If the council need the money - then put cameras in the loading bays and up the double yellow lines and fine the people that are parking illegally, numerous times I have to block the road outside of my shop due to people parking in the loading bay, leading to angry people behind beeping etc.
- Would it not be more beneficial to put a charity parking box instead to help local charities?
- How much will it cost to put the machines in? Why not put in public toilets in and charge 20p, this would provide the local community something they really need whilst also making some money for the council.

On a personal note from myself at Fruity Roots this will destroy my business, you will push my local customers to main stream supermarkets. I employ local people who would lose their job as would I. I have previously served the community as a postwoman and a Firefighter. I gave up these roles to support the community in a different way, helping society and our younger generation look for healthier choices and a healthier lifestyle and this could be gone in the blink of an eye.

Look forward to hearing your decision.

I get you need to get some money back but you are not helping people to go into the city centre and shop with put prices up. Also to take away the chance of paying cash to park is terrible, you shouldn't take that away from shoppers.

Nope nope nope. If you want to keep any part of the city accessible and even try to make it busier even though the lack of shops is embarrassing then parking costs should be lowered rather than highered

I strongly object to introducing or increasing parking charges in Plymouth. It is an incredibly challenging financial climate currently and I really think now would be a terrible time to start taking more money off the people of Plymouth.

I am writing in response to the proposed changes to parking charges in Plymouth.

I am COMPLETELY and UTTERLY against an increase in the resident parking permit fee to be in line with inflation, increasing from £30 to £41 annually, an increase of 27%. Not only is that NOT in line with inflation, it is also a really poor reflection on the city to ask already struggling families and singletons to have yet another increase in an annual bill, which is 17% over the current inflation rate of 10%. Perhaps if the city council did something about ALL OF THE WORK VANS AND TRUCKS that park in residential areas, often taking up 2 on-street spaces, that could be a good revenue stream either through additional permitting or increasing the window of time to 24/7 for residential parking areas then issuing parking tickets to all non-residents as a potential revenue stream for the city council as there is no end to this occurring in the St. Judes / Prince Rock / Cattedown area. It is often quite difficult to find any place to park in this area in the evenings after returning from work or a night out. The fact that I may not be able to park on my street if I were to go out makes me stay at home more often and therefore not out frequenting local businesses.

I've also seen that you want to introduce resident parking charges based on a car's emissions. My car, which is now 10 years old, is in fine working order, but there is absolutely no way that I can afford to replace it with a newer, greener vehicle. Looking around my neighbourhood, I would gather that most of the residents around here are very much in a similar position. I know that the city has a NetZero plan, but again, timing is key. I am lucky in that I have a converted e-bike, but that is no good when I need to travel to my allotment and come back with several trugs/baskets full of produce, hence the use of my car. The vast majority of the time, it remains parked and does not add CO2 to the atmosphere. I drive less than 4000 miles a year and that includes my annual road trip to the Scottish Highlands and back again. Being penalised based on the car emissions when I so infrequently drive is also a kick in the teeth.

As for the other proposed changes, Plymouth doesn't have the same level of affluence as other cities in the UK, so why should parking charges be more in line with places that are more affluent than the SW. The SW is one of the most deprived areas in the UK and so to have cheaper parking than many other places in the country isn't a radical way to think. This proposed increase will likely drive even more people away from the city centre and even more to shopping online, leaving the city centre to further decline and businesses close. Given the current catastrophe that businesses face due to the rising and uncapped energy costs, doing anything possible to keep people coming to the city centre would be better as open businesses pay business rates to the council, whereas closed businesses do not. I am all for encouraging and growing a green economy (I work as a marine ecologist), but in the midst of a cost of living crisis is not the best time to enact such measures as people are currently having to decide whether to eat or heat their homes.

Regarding moving to paying electronically for parking with a debit card, credit card, mobile app, etc., it really annoys me to no end that you get charged 20p over and above the parking charge when using RingGo. If you want to include that fee, make it part of a flat parking fee. That would give the city council an extra 20p for every parking transaction, but the cost would be the same no matter what method people used to pay.

So, please consider these points. I know the council has a shortfall, but asking the residents to foot the bill in the midst of the most challenging time for people in the last several decades may not be the wisest of decisions

I agreed with the proposed increase in parking fees in Plymouth city centre. I don't like busy shops and this proposal should reduce the number of people using the city centre shops. Well done Plymouth City Council.

I'm horrified at these increases. "In line with other towns etc." only compares with London. Everywhere else in Devon & Cornwall is much cheaper. This will only increase the exodus from

our dying Plymouth centre. I barely visit living in Plymstock I will continue to show locally and on line for other products not available. No doubt I'm not the only one.

I have read through the many pages of the above proposal.

I am sure I have read somewhere that all payments are going to be made using an app using a smart phone or else by calling a number but I cannot find mention of this in the aforementioned proposal. I would mention that the picture in the Herald showed a pound coin being put into a machine.

Can you advise whether this is the case, please? This is the part I would wish to object to as I feel it will discriminate against many older people who do not have a mobile phone and it will stop them going out if they know they are unable to pay.

Discrimination against those with dyslexia and who struggle with IT

I am rather shocked that the council would suggest a course of action that discriminates against certain members of the community.

I am absolutely against getting rid of cash payment parking meters. This doesn't only effect some older people but anyone who may struggle with mobile phones/apps or doesn't want to use them for whatever reason or doesn't have bank cards. Use cash or lose it with everything that will entail.

Objection

I write to object to the proposed amendments to the Resident Visitor Parking Permit scheme in the Cross Park area of Crownhill.

A. This is a small, residential area, far from the City Centre and therefore does not compare with the other areas shown in the report, with their needs for transport access. Cross Park is not a thoroughfare. The only reason for entering the Cross Park area is as a resident or to visit a specific property.

There is, however, a road-safety issue in that if there are no visitor tickets available, the only alternative, other than parking in neighbouring streets with no restrictions, is the Crownhill, Alexandra Road car park, which has restricted parking. The access road is narrow and any extra traffic build-up will cause more congestion and also take up spaces that would otherwise be used by people wishing to use the local business services.

There is also the extra safety issue, particularly for the elderly or infirm, of walking from the car park to the Cross Park area.

B. "Removing the Annual Visitor Permits available in some zones to ensure a fair and consistent approach across the City."

This is not a reason, just a statement. However, as residents currently hold a yearly Visitor Permit, it has to be assumed that it is for purely financial reasons. The full terms and conditions of the Resident and Visitor parking were agreed upon by discussion with the Council and the Residents. The residents do not wish to have that agreement amended in any way. It is however accepted that costs increase over time and that inflation increases may be applied

Detrimental Effect on Residents

C. This proposal will cause a substantial, additional financial burden on most residents and equally seriously, the inability to have more than 90 visits by friends, carers, family, trades people etc. in any 12-month period. This is not only unjustifiable but also iniquitous, as those residents are being discriminated against because of living in a 'CPZ' area.

Many of the residents are older, elderly or disabled and look forward to, and in fact require, visits from family and friends. Over the years and increasingly during and subsequent to the Pandemic, we have been encouraged to engage with our elderly residents. The proposed measures seem to run counter to these wishes and could place an additional financial burden on the Council in the long-run, because friends and family may be unable to make timely visits to ensure the well-being of elderly or needy residents.

There are also, of course, younger residents who also have friends and family who wish to visit. Additionally, if residents are unable to use on-street parking, they may well find it necessary to create a parking space out of what is now a garden area, thereby removing valuable green space.

Small businesses in the area will be adversely affected, possibly to such a degree that they will be unable to continue to work from their home. This would clearly cause economic hardship.

Cost ramifications

D. On reading various reports regarding Local authority parking charges, the clear implication is that authorities should not use parking charges as simply a revenue-gathering scheme. Looking at the figures below, P.C.C. can hardly be said to be doing anything else.

The current charge for an annual visitor permit is £15. The proposed charges of up to £100 (an equivalent 566% increase) for only a 24% maximum possible number of visits are, quite frankly, scandalous.

As the highest increase in other proposed parking charges appears to relate to the Accessibility Permit, which will rise from £40 to £60 - a 50% increase in cost, the residents of the Cross Park area seem to be being treated unfairly.

Summary

I understand that it is illegal for Local Authorities to raise parking charges solely for the provision of revenue to provide for other activities and that the level of charges should be based on the need to manage parking. It appears that Section 55 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 does not provide Local Authorities with powers to set parking charges at a level greater than that needed to relieve or prevent traffic congestion. I would also point out that if a Local Authority sets parking charges in order to raise revenue, it can be deemed to be acting "ultra vires" if it cannot show that the proposed charges are necessary to relieve or prevent traffic congestion.

It appears that the proposals at The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) Amendment No: 2022 2137287 in relation to the Crownhill Area do not manage parking or either relieve or prevent traffic congestion.

I therefore invite you to review this objection and withdraw the proposed changes to the Visitor Parking Permit scheme in the Crownhill Area. Surely, in the best interests of all concerned, it would be sensible and equitable to increase the cost of the Visitor Permit in line with that of the Resident Parking permit.

I oppose your parking modernisation proposal.

Your proposals come at a time people are struggling to put food on the table.

Pcc timing is disgusting, this has nothing to do with carbon footprint, and it's about taking more money from residents.

You mention inflation "raising residents parking in line with inflation"

This isn't in line with inflation.

Residents have to pay a fee to hopefully be able to park close to their home, and now you want to increase this fee when the parking problem is not their fault.

Disabled bays are not policed. You propose a disabled person should pay a fee to hopefully have a bay outside their home, yet other drivers can park in it with no repercussion.

You are not bringing the fee in line with other councils, quite a lot still charge no fee for this service. You have averaged out the fees other councils charge, given a few are greedy this has worked in your favour.

Removing cash payments from street systems limits people who don't have a more modern form of payment facility. You assume everyone has this and most don't trust pcc with access to their payment details.

Businesses are already struggling, increasing guest parking and business permits will just ensure you drive visitors and trades away.

Everything you have proposed is purely to squeeze more money from the very people who sadly have no choice but to employ you.

You didn't mention under these proposals at what rate councillors and the mayor pay for their parking when attending council meetings. This information would be very welcome along with what restrictions are implemented.

I have read your proposals on parking, and I feel that I need to oppose the way you want to go forward with a cashless system.

There are still a lot of older people who don't use smart phones, and therefore they will be unable to use Apps etc. to use the car parks. Why can't you use a system that accepts both cash, and Apps, then you keep everyone happy.

I believe this is Ageist, as I've already mentioned, a lot of older people don't use smart phones. However, I believe you've probably already made up your minds to go cashless.

All these ideas seem perfectly reasonable.

Please can you raise my concerns that you are going to remove our visitors parking passes? I will actually need to move if that's the case or I won't see my family. I won't be able to have any work carried out on my home. This is really concerning. We have been through enough in the last few years without the worry of now having to find a new home so our family can visit. We are being punished for living in the centre of the city when it's the commuters who cause the issues not the residents.

I have just read on our community Web page that you are going to make our permit parking all day. Please don't do that. I will run out if visitor's passes and I won't have any visitors. I can't afford to buy more than one book a year in the current climate.

I'm totally against an increase in parking fees in this city.

We are entering one of the most serious cost of living crises in our memory, and this will make it even worse.

The cost of fuel is proving hard enough.

We simply cannot afford it!

Below are issues I would like to raise.

1. Why is there the need to do away with cash payments, these should be possible at all parking sites. There are people who do not have bank cards/ mobile phones.
2. Multi-storey car parks should be pay on exit - hence no confusion when parking about time, over staying etc.
3. Car parking spaces need to be adapted to make the parking of modern day cars easier. This will not only make their parking easier but will also make life easier for those who park in their bay correctly but perhaps drive smaller cars. Trying to get into your car parked correctly but with two "Chelsea tractors" now parked beside you is not fun.
4. Ensure that all car parking places have the correct time showing on them - a few minutes out can make the difference of another hour being charged.

I would like to comment on your proposals to increase parking from 50p to £2 an hour. This is a huge increase, the 50p charge is so affordable right now, and why are you going to put more pressure on already struggling families.

The scheme to make the car parks closer to the centre more expensive will make it harder for disabled people who can't afford the higher charges. What are you putting in place for disabled people?

The ridiculous £40 charge to allow blue badge holders to use the car parks is bad enough but to increase it to £60 is terrible. I can't afford that. And you say able to use all car parks. How will Blue badge holders use drakes circus car park in your £60 scheme? Plus you say it allowed us to use the car parks for free. It's not free s we have to pay £60 for the privilege.

Finally, how do you expect some of the older people cope with cash less machines. I witness an old gentleman trying to pay for parking in the market car park with his card and it would not accept it. He was getting so Distressed.

This is just another way to make more money from us comes with the cost of living crisis right now, this is the wrong time to be increasing prices

Parking in our Ridgeway car parks..

I understand it is currently proposed to keep the free parking in the car parks which business owners are grateful for, However in our beauty salon where we work some customers are having treatments with us for 3 hrs, or if they have treatment with us they haven't got time to visit other shops in the high street without worrying about their limited time running out.

This is also going to have a devastating impact on all businesses on The Ridgeway.

Councils have put charges in car parks in other small towns and we have seen shops sadly decline.

Look at the state of Plymouth, charges have led to people on line shopping instead...

I can see the current problems people have been getting is from people who park their cars in the car parks all day and go off into the town shopping on the bus avoiding the park & ride facility that is available, could you please look into why they are not using the park & ride.

What are you proposing to do about business owners and staff who work in the businesses on the Ridgeway?

Business owners and staff should NOT be forced into paying parking charges.

Also a lot of elderly public visit the shops on the ridgeway rather than face going all the way into Plymouth and face charges from parking, they would not be able to use the proposed machines via using a smart phone/ app as most people do not have a smart phone to do this.

People would park in nearby streets to avoid charges which will then cause further problems.

If the council are looking to raise extra funds may I suggest they get more traffic wardens on the Ridgeway during the day as we constantly every day get people who are too lazy to park in the car parks and walk, they park on the double yellow lines causing obstruction for the bus and large lorries to pass through.

I am concerned about future of our free parking may lead eventually to charges, and no help for business owners or staff that work on the ridgeway.

I wish to object to these proposals as it may lead eventually to charges.

As a resident, 2 Central Park Ave, Plymouth PL4 6NW, UK I would like to voice my concerns at the rise in the cost of the parking permit for residents.

As a resident suffering from severe mental health issues and council tax exempt these small changes in prices can have massive impacts.

I agree with nearly every other aspect of your changes but cannot agree with them whilst the residents parking permit cost will be increased. My ability to survive on a day to day living is consistently getting squeezed by cost of living crisis and I'm not sure how much more I am able to take.

It's not enjoyable to continue living and the government's decisions on a local and national level seems to forget about people like me.

The decision to support Ukraine at the cost of thousands of UK citizen's wellbeing is short sighted and extremely dangerous.

In short, I cannot support these changes whilst the resident permit charge will be increased.

In response to your plans outlined in today's Herald for the future of Parking in the Plymouth car parks. If it is within your intention to have Phone or App options only throughout the city car parks, I and many senior citizens would be inconvenienced. Older local residents do prefer to use cash and not visa/Debit cards to park their cars.

With regards to the proposed increase in prices, I do find this is acceptable and justified. Perhaps the additional income to the Council funds could be put to good use improving the facilities around Plymouth Hoe i.e. usable toilets, repaired hand safety rails (Health & Safety Hazard), uneven steps, in the areas below and adjacent to the Hoe Swimming pool. As a frequent visitor to the Hoe, walking and swimming, it is one of the main attractions within the City. I and many locals and visitors consider it to be run down and an eyesore, needing an urgent attention and a good "Clean-up".

I don't use the phone app only cash payments so won't be using the car parks

I have read the proposals regarding the changes to parking in Plymouth.

I wanted to voice my concerns regarding the price increase for parking. I do appreciate the council is not excluded from the rising costs, however with the looming recession, I feel the council's priority should be giving businesses the best chance possible to survive the crippling decline of the high street. With the convenience of online shopping ever increasing, increasing parking charges are just going to push customers to shop online more and further help the decline of the highstreets.

I appreciate Plymouth charges may not be in line with other cities, but we do not have the same high street temptations as other cities either. In the past decade we have seen an increase in

empty shops, closing businesses and the shops that are surviving are not enticing people to visit the higher street in person.

My concern is also the cost to visit the city centre for a brief amount of time. I begrudge paying a minimum of 2 hours parking if I simply need to collect an order and will opt to have that item delivered.

I also want to express concern regarding the move away from cashless machines. We still have generations of citizens that are not smartphone literate and will be intimidated at the thought of having to pay via the phone.

Also, I am aware that the signal in the city centre is very unreliable. If you are visiting Plymouth and do not have the correct app, it is impossible to rely on 4G/5G or the free Wi-Fi available in some parts of the centre to be able to download the relevant app.

I am also aware that the app charges a service charge to use the app which makes parking that much more expensive again.

I hope you consider my reservations regarding the proposed changes in the next steps of this proposal.

I live at 23 abbey court palace street and the parking is shocking 40 flats but 8 spaces that we are allowed to get permits for ridiculous so I pay for my permit but still have to pay to park because there are never any spaces something needs to be done

x 61 copies

**I write to object to the proposed amendments to the Resident Visitor Parking Permit scheme in the Cross Park area of Crownhill .**

**A.** This is a small, residential area, far from the City Centre and therefore does not compare with the other areas shown in the report, with their needs for transport access. Cross Park is not a thoroughfare. The only reason for entering the Cross Park area is as a resident or to visit a specific property.

There is, however, a road-safety issue in that if there are no visitor tickets available, the only alternative, other than parking in neighbouring streets with no restrictions, is the Crownhill, Alexandra Road car park, which has restricted parking. The access road is narrow and any extra traffic build-up will cause more congestion and also take up spaces that would otherwise be used by people wishing to use the local business services.

There is also the extra safety issue, particularly for the elderly or infirm, of walking from the car park to the Cross Park area.

**B. "Removing the Annual Visitor Permits available in some zones to ensure a fair and consistent approach across the City."**

This is not a reason, just a statement. However, as residents currently hold a yearly Visitor Permit, it has to be assumed that it is for purely financial reasons. **The full terms and conditions of the Resident and Visitor parking were agreed upon by discussion with the Council and the Residents. The residents do not wish to have that agreement amended in any way. It is however accepted that costs increase over time and that inflation increases may be applied**

**Detrimental Effect on Residents**

**C.** This proposal will cause a substantial, additional financial burden on most residents and equally seriously, the inability to have more than 90 visits by friends, carers, family, trades people etc in any 12-month period. This is not only unjustifiable but also iniquitous, as those residents are being discriminated against because of living in a 'CPZ' area.

Many of the residents are older, elderly or disabled and look forward to, and in fact require, visits from family and friends. Over the years and increasingly during and subsequent to the Pandemic, we have been encouraged to engage with our elderly residents. The proposed measures seem to run counter to these wishes and could place an additional financial burden on the Council in the long-run, because friends and family may be unable to make timely visits to ensure the well-being of elderly or needy residents.

There are also, of course, younger residents who also have friends and family who wish to visit.

Additionally, if residents are unable to use on-street parking, they may well find it necessary to create a parking space out of what is now a garden area, thereby removing valuable green space.

**Small businesses in the area will be adversely affected, possibly to such a degree that they will be unable to continue to work from their home. This would clearly cause economic hardship.**

#### Cost ramifications

D. On reading various reports regarding Local authority parking charges, the clear implication is that authorities should not use parking charges as simply a revenue-gathering scheme. Looking at the figures below, P.C.C. can hardly be said to be doing anything else.

The current charge for an annual visitor permit is £15. The proposed charges of up to £100 (an equivalent 566% increase) for only a 24% maximum possible number of visits are, quite frankly, scandalous.

As the highest increase in other proposed parking charges appears to relate to the Accessibility Permit, which will rise from £40 to £60 - a 50% increase in cost, the residents of the Cross Park area seem to be being treated unfairly.

#### Summary

I understand that it is illegal for Local Authorities to raise parking charges solely for the provision of revenue to provide for other activities and that the level of charges should be based on the need to manage parking. It appears that Section 55 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 does not provide Local Authorities with powers to set parking charges at a level greater than that needed to relieve or prevent traffic congestion. I would also point out that if a Local Authority sets parking charges in order to raise revenue, it can be deemed to be acting "ultra vires" if it cannot show that the proposed charges are necessary to relieve or prevent traffic congestion.

It appears that the proposals at **The City of Plymouth (Traffic Regulation and Street Parking Places) Amendment No: 2022 2137287** in relation to the Crownhill Area do not manage parking or either relieve or prevent traffic congestion.

I therefore invite you to review this objection and withdraw the proposed changes to the Visitor Parking Permit scheme in the Crownhill Area. Surely, in the best interests of all concerned, it would be sensible and equitable to increase the cost of the Visitor Permit in line with that of the Resident Parking permit.