

Appendix 3 – Summary of Consultation Responses

The total number of responses received was 61.

Question 1

Should City Centre Residents have access to on-street parking spaces through one or more shared space residents parking schemes?

Over 80% of respondents were in favour of the principle of permitting residents to have access to on-street spaces through a permit scheme.

Question 2

Is the extent of the city centre proposed shared space proposals right? Should any particular types of residential development be excluded?

Question 2 was essentially in two parts. Of the 30 respondents that provided a clear response to the first half of the question, approximately 66% stated that the extent of the scheme was right. Two respondents stated that the zones were too large. Many people simply replied “No” despite being in favour of the scheme, so it was assumed that these respondents were replying to the second part of the question.

Of the remaining 39 respondent that provided a clear response the second part of the question, about 50% clearly stated that no properties should be excluded. Five people suggested that student accommodation should be excluded. Three people suggested that properties with existing parking should be excluded and three people suggested that social housing or HMOs should be excluded.

Question 3

Which on-street parking areas should be excluded from any scheme in the city centre to support local businesses and shops?

This question divided opinion with 44% of respondents stating that no area should be excluded from the scheme. About 25% thought that areas adjacent to main retail areas should be excluded, while 10% suggested the areas around Bedford Place and London Road should not be part of the scheme.

Question 4

Should the Red Zone be excluded from any potential on-street residents parking scheme due to the high demand for use by non residents?

Again, this question divided opinion with 45% of respondents stating that the Red Zone should not be excluded from the scheme and about the same number stating that it should. A small number of respondents suggested a compromise such as allowing residents’ parking in off peak hours.

Question 5

Should the number of permits be restricted in a zone to allow for turnover of spaces but also prevent excessive levels of demand where new developments take place?

Around half of respondents (49%) thought that some form of restrictions should apply to any proposed permit schemes, while 26% of respondents were directly opposed to any form of restriction. The remaining 25% made no comment, had no strong views either way or had alternative suggestions. These included making the different parking zones smaller (two respondents) and giving more consideration to parking requirements when developments went ahead (one respondent).

Question 6

Should the cost of such permits reflect the cost of providing the service, the need to support sustainable transport modes as well as the amenity to the individual and income implications to the Council? This could mean different prices for different zones?

50% of respondents thought that it was reasonable for the cost of the permit to reflect the cost of providing the service and the need to support sustainable travel options, while 20% were opposed to this approach. Of the remaining respondents, four used this question to strongly object to the proposed £1000 minimum price and three suggested that any revenue raised should be ring fenced for sustainable transport. One stated that the Blue Zone should be cheapest, one stated that the Outer Zones should be cheapest, one stated that the elderly and disable should be taken into consideration when setting the cost and one suggested that the cost reflect schemes in nearby towns and cities.

Question 7

Should the permits allow parking by residents in a space continuously or should they be time limited in some way to allow a turnover of spaces.

56% of respondents thought that residents who purchase a permit should have continuous access to parking spaces in the City Centre with no form of time restrictions. 25% thought there should be some form of time limit in order to encourage turnover of vehicles in given spaces. The remaining respondents made no comment.

Question 8

Should the permits be available to all residents in an area irrespective of whether they already have an off street parking space or should those properties with off street parking not be eligible?

55% of respondents stated that properties which already had access to off street parking should not be eligible for the scheme. A further 8% of respondents stated that residents who did not have access to off street parking should have priority over those who do. 20% of respondents stated that it should apply to all residents. The remaining respondents made no comment.

Question 9

Do you have any additional comments?

The additional comments are summarised alongside the number of respondents who made that comment.

- Reiterated support for the scheme in principle (15 respondents)
- The proposed cost of the parking permits (£1000) is too high (5 respondents)
- The proposal for City Centre resident parking permits is vital for the redevelopment of the Fruit and Vegetable Market and/or other City Centre sites (4 respondents)
- Visitor parking needs to be considered as part of the proposal (3 respondents)
- Parking schemes should reflect access needs of visitors and workers (2 respondents)
- Rethink problem and consider alternative solutions (1 respondent)
- Further documentation on this proposal should be clear and concise (1 respondent)
- Visitor Park and Ride should also be considered alongside additional parking for cycles and motorbikes (1 respondent)

- Consideration needs to be given to how the grey zone will operate on Match Days (1 respondent)
- Red Zone parking meter prices should be reduced and maximum stay extended to two hours (1 respondent)
- Current parking policy works for most (1 respondent)
- More consideration needs to be given to the long term parking needs of future developments (1 respondent)
- Residents should have access to free parking (1 respondent)
- Properties in multiple occupancy cause problems because they own more cars (1 respondent)
- Proposal needs careful work and should reflect good practice from other cities (1 respondent)