

SUMMARY OF OBJECTIONS TO VARIATION OF FEES FOR ON-STREET PARKING PERMITS IN WINCHESTER

OBJECTOR	OBJECTION		OFFICER'S COMMENTS
1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 24, 27, 28, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 54, 55, 58, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 92, 95, 96, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 105, 106, 107, 111, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 128, 129, 131, 132, 133, 134, 137, 138, 140, 143, 146, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 159, 162, 165, 168, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 183, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 192, 194, 195, 197, 199, 200, 201, 202, 205, 206P to 261P, 262, 263, 264, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 273, 274, 277, 278, 283, 284, 286, 287, 288, 289, 291, 292, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303P to 601P, 604, 605, 606, & 609.	a) The increase of 33% for first permit, 233% for second, and 66% for third and fourth permits, is excessive and above inflation and the reasons for the increase are not clearly given in the notice.	(i)	Although the percentage increase is high the actual increase is £5.00 for the first permit. The cost of permits in Winchester has only been increased once since they were first introduced in 1970 - if inflation were to be applied to this the current cost of permits would be in excess of £100.00. The cost of £50.00 for the second, third and fourth permit is reasonable when taking this into account. It must be noted that it is not practical to increase the cost of permits by a small amount each year due to the lengthy TRO procedure that must be adhered to.
1, 21, 23, 50, 66, 69, 82, 100, 104, 127, 135, 157, 160, 168, 173, 178, 181, 187, 191, 203, 265, 272, 274, 275, 276, 280, 291 & 607.	b) Yet more tax to pay.	(ii)	This is more of a general complaint and is not considered to grounds for objecting to the proposal.
2, 11, 37, 56, 57, 59, 70, 81, 88, 97, 108, 130, 141, 156, 158, 161, 267, 268, 279, 282, 285, 293, 295 & 608.	c) Increase in second, third and fourth permit penalises legitimate users and those on low income.	(iii)	The cost of visitors permits is not excessive when taking into account that the cost of permits has not increased since 1970. Residents do not have to purchase visitors permits. Option of purchasing book of scratchcards is available and will result in no increase in cost.
3, 11, 94, 109, 141, 163 & 166.	d) Not enough parking attendants/sufficient enforcement.	(iv)	This is more of a general complaint and is not considered to grounds for objecting to the proposal.
3, 28, 72, 80, 142 & 188.	e) Taxing their visitors or workmen.	(v)	The option of purchasing visitors permits is the residents choice. Their visitors could use public car parks, however, in the long run this would be far more expensive.
5, 12, 15, 39, 53, 112, 113, 118, 126, 172, 204, 269 & 301.	f) There is a lack of parking spaces.	(vi)	Stepped increase in second, third and fourth permits might influence parking habits of those who may be able to park off street, thus potentially creating more space, however, it is not physically possible to increase the area of highway available for parking.
6, 26, 51, 78, 120, 127, 138, 139, 147, 148, 160, 163, 164, 182, 185, 193, 281, 290, 602 & 603.	g) Wants more efficient way of controlling parking.	(vii)	Alternative system would be very expensive to introduce. Now WCC has committed to decriminalised parking enforcement it must continue.
14 & 274.	h) Excessive increase for guest house and business permits	(viii)	Although the percentage increase is high, the actual increase is not that great and spread over the year and per customer is very low.
18	i) Stepped increase in permit cost is unfair on those who do not have off-street parking.	(ix)	This is more of a complaint and is not considered to grounds for objecting to the proposal. The option of purchasing permits or the number of permits purchased is the residents choice.
22	j) There is no need for parking restrictions. Waste of money and resources.	(x)	This is more of a general complaint and is not considered to grounds for objecting to the proposal.
25, 30, 31, 54, 71, 75, 83, 102, 123, 134, 135, 140, 143, 144, 167, 183, 184, 189, 191, 194, 197, 270, 275, 279 & 289,.	k) The Statement of Reasons is not satisfactory	(xi)	This is a standard legal requirement for all TROs and is the general reason for progressing an Order, not a justification for each individual change within an Order. All orders for residents parking zones are progressed on traffic management grounds to optimise and control parking facilities.
61 & 75.	l) Too much vandalism to parked cars.	(xii)	This is more of a general complaint and is not considered to grounds for objecting to the proposal.
65, 70, 110, 142, 157, 197, 608 & 609.	m) Does not guarantee a space outside their house.	(xiii)	It is not legal to allocate space on the highway for individuals to park. This is not considered grounds for objecting to the proposal.
73, 89, 93, 109, 110, 112, 136 & 169.	n) Wants time limits for restrictions to be reviewed.	(xiv)	This is more of a general complaint and is not considered to grounds for objecting to the proposal.
119	o) Does not have a car. However, visitors have problems parking.	(xv)	This is more of a general complaint and is not considered to grounds for objecting to the proposal.
145 & 193.	p) In SUPPORT of increases as it still a very cheap price to pay.	(xvi)	N/A
175	q) Bays are not maintained and won't be improved.	(xvii)	This is more of a general complaint and is not considered to grounds for objecting to the proposal.
175	r) Vehicles parked in residents bays without permits.	(xviii)	This is more of a general complaint and is not considered to grounds for objecting to the proposal.
196	s) Only has a permit for use by visitors and does not see why they should pay the same as those that use their permits every day.	(xiv)	This is more of a general complaint and is not considered to grounds for objecting to the proposal.
198 & 203.	t) Will not reduce the number of vehicles parked on street.	(xx)	This is more of a general complaint and is not considered to grounds for objecting to the proposal.