

Statement: PS20.26

Cabinet – 24TH JANUARY 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 – Introduction of Pay and Display Parking for District Car Parks

Statement submitted by: Jenny French

I understand the council are planning to charge £1 an hour to park in the carpark next to the WoT Methodist Church.

I am strongly against this decision. If it is brought in, there will be a negative effect on nearby business and activities. If the public do still want to come they are likely to park on residential roads nearby - causing further nuisance to locals.

Statement: PS20.27

Cabinet – 24TH JANUARY 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 – Introduction of Pay and Display Parking for District Car Parks

Statement submitted by: Simon Richards

Whilst not against a charge in principle, there is a lot of opposition concerned with impact on local trade. Surely a free 1st 30minutes as with on street parking in neighbouring parking zones would be a reasonable compromise and be seen as consistent across the city and allay a lot of opposition.

Statement: PS20.28

Cabinet – 24TH JANUARY 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 – Introduction of Pay and Display Parking for District Car Parks

Statement submitted by: Les Tandy

If proposals to charge car parking in Westbury go ahead it will seriously affect the businesses and trades in the village.

There should be a limited time for parking, to stop outsiders parking up and then travelling on buses. The car park will be clogged up with business people, not necessarily shoppers. Parking on a Sunday would be good if it was free, to allow people to attend church.

Statement: PS20.29

Cabinet – 24TH JANUARY 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 – Introduction of Pay and Display Parking for District Car Parks

Statement submitted by: Rev. Cheryl Hawkins

I am writing to lodge an objection to the proposal of parking charges for the Westbury on Trym car park which is at the hart of the village.

The car park is a central facility for the village and is used by many for Drs Surgery, Church, clubs at the Methodist Church hall and for accessing the shops. By charging for the parking it will severely hamper access to these services for the most vulnerable in the village. Together with the cost of living crisis this will impact on a lot of people who access these services for shops, medical assistance and for spiritual and community care.

I understand that a standard solution has been proposed across the 16 car parks across the City - this feels a very blanket approach to a problems which is individual to the places where the car parks are - I therefore wish to encourage a solution that is appropriate for each car park on the communities individual needs.

Please reconsider your proposals at the next meeting.

Statement: PS20.30

Cabinet – 24TH JANUARY 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 – Introduction of Pay and Display Parking for District Car Parks

Statement submitted by: Leonie Stokes

I wanted to register my disappointment and concern with your plans to charge for parking in the Westbury Hill car park as I think this will have a really negative effect on our local community and the businesses in the village.

Why would people pay to park when they can use other shops and supermarkets for free... why would people use the coffee shops, adding extra cost when times are hard and everyone is struggling.

To charge is just one more blow for our community, small changes, which will have a massive impact.

I urge you to reconsider this plan, get the positive publicity you need from listening to the community and giving people a break!

Statement: PS20.31

Cabinet – 24th January 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 - : Pay and Display Car parks

Statement submitted by: Andrew Renshaw

Cabinet Meeting 24 Jan: Introduction of Car Park Charges in District Car Parks

I write this as a keen walker, a regular cyclist, public transport user and motorist. The report tells us that the introduction of car park charges is about transport policy and encouraging modal shift away from cars. No account has been taken of the economic and social health of the centres affected. All local retail centres have gone through traumatic times with Covid, internet shopping and the recession. This at a time when we now have the **least frequent and most unreliable bus services in Bristol that there has ever been.**

Turning to Westbury on Trym, the centre is barely holding its own. It remains a focus for banking, with all the big 4 banks + Nationwide building Society. **But HSBC recently announced its closure.** Many visits to the car park are for banking and charging will be bound to deter some from using the banks there and the other businesses at the same time. The car park also serves the health centre, which when built paid for a major upgrade. It also serves a **multitude of daytime classes, social and religious activities put on by volunteers** - club/ lunches for the elderly, Ukrainians, toddlers, Warm in Westbury, Friday market to name but a few.

Shoppers in the area have a choice of going to Cribbs Causeway with abundant free parking or to nearby Henleaze or to the discount Aldi and Lidi stores in Southmead and Henbury, all with free parking; there is the challenge from internet shopping; the charges proposed are bound to impact on the large range of independents and small supermarkets in Westbury. Accordingly, the far greater impact will be that car borne shoppers will shop less and harm the economic and social health of a key town centre - as Westbury is defined for planning purposes.

Last year I participated in a **survey of the car park.** It showed there was little breach of the 3 hour limit and no evidence of all day parking - we can provide the information - which your officers contend is a reason for charging. Our survey also showed that limiting free parking to 2 hours would not make a huge difference to availability of spaces. No such level of survey has been undertaken by your officers. The proposed season ticket idea is nonsensical as it would have the reverse effect - business users would displace short term shoppers/social needs parking.

Regarding modal shift, the 1 Cribbs to City Centre bus route, was every 10 minutes off peak a few years ago, now its every 20, with frequent gaps of 40 minutes due to cancellations so modal shift will be unaffected. East west services are poor. Services on Sunday will not attract modal change, so **charging on Sundays will have no positive impact on transport policy.** Charging will also have the adverse effect of encouraging motorists to search the surrounding residential streets for a free space.

It is disgraceful that **no consultation has taken place** and this report is hidden away in the cabinet papers. Your equality review (p 136/7) shows that the **greatest impacts will be on the elderly, disabled people with impairments that are not blue badge holders, pregnancy and socio-economic deprivation.** Despite the **heavy use of the car park on Sundays by the local churches,** it fails to record any adverse impact on religion or belief (not only relevant to Westbury); many of the church attenders will also be elderly and needing to be transported by car and will be required to pay £2. Several of the other car parks are within a stone's throw of free Aldi and Lidl car parks

- eg Machin Road, West Town Lane, Chalks Lane, Ducie Road, where motorists will park instead and this will likely add to their trade at the expense of local shops.

If there is to be any charging, for the sake of the socio economic health of the village (and the other centres affected) there should be at least 30 mins free, no charging on a Sunday and a maximum of £1.50 for three hours.

Andrew Renshaw, MRTPI (retd) Westbury on Trym resident

Statement: PS20.32

Cabinet – 24th January 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 - : Pay and Display Parking

Statement submitted by: Andy Winser

As a resident of Westbury on Trym I wish to register my objection to the City Councils plan to introduce parking charges to use the Westbury Village Car Park.

My reasons are both personal and general, including:

- The Village is already suffering badly from recession and neglect, this proposal in my opinion will be it's death nail
- I am a patient at the Westbury Surgery, will there be provision for users of the surgery, otherwise this is a tax on the sick and ill
- There are already issues re street parking in and around Westbury, I cannot see how this plan will help

Kind Regards
Andy Winser

Statement: PS20.33

Cabinet – 24th January 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 - : Pay and Display Parking

Statement submitted by: Catherine Farrington

Introduction of Pay and Display Parking in District Car Parks - Westbury Hill

- We are concerned that charging for parking will deter patients from attending appointments and potentially increase the number of home visits GPs will need to accommodate in an already over-stretched service. We would suggest free parking for the first hour to accommodate patient care. For any longer period, we would support the Council in charging for parking and would be in favour of an increased rate (i.e. £2 per hour after the first free hour). We are aware that other businesses and Councillor Geoff Gallop, have expressed support for 30 minutes' free parking. Whilst we understand the intention is to support both us and other businesses, limiting the free period to 30 minutes is problematic for the Surgery. Many appointments take longer than 30 minutes; for example, chronic disease reviews, complex wound dressings and appointments where both a nurse and GP are required to be seen simultaneously. Unfortunately, we also have to adapt to ever-changing daily situations. Increasingly, we manage urgent cases on the day which can cause clinicians to run late, resulting in patient waiting times being extended. This is regrettable but unavoidable. The concern is that patients may approach us with statements such as: 'I only have 10 minutes of free parking left and need to be seen now.' The Surgery cannot accommodate such requests which would increase pressure on an already struggling NHS Primary Care service.
- We are pleased to learn that there will be no charge or time limit for Blue Badge Holders. However, disabled parking spaces are in short supply in the car park and we would urge the addition of more.
- We are concerned about issues relating to the availability of an annual permit. The Surgery has a strong 'cycle to work' scheme and encourages those who are local to walk. We also have staff members who commute from further afield and may find a permit an attractive option. However, this does need to be put in perspective: we have 70 staff and potentially half of those would like a permit, which would significantly reduce the parking available for local people. These will include our patients and we are keen not to restrict their access. We suspect that local business providers/staff may also see an annual permit as an attractive option. This has the potential to reduce further the availability of spaces for those attending appointments at the Surgery as well as customers supporting local businesses. *Please note, our own car park is restricted to the use of clinicians who need to provide urgent services throughout the day, for example home visits.*
- As the Surgery is located to the rear of the car park, many individuals mistakenly believe we own it. These include the Police and residents who occasionally come to us to ask for CCTV footage following an incident/minor car collision. Of course, we cannot provide such footage, as we do not monitor the car park. The introduction of charges is likely to increase the number of individuals mistakenly coming to the Surgery to complain about e.g. money

being lost in machines, tickets etc. We therefore request that the signage is improved and clarity provided to state explicitly that the Surgery should not be approached for car parking concerns.

- We request that any parking meters should accept cash to support those who do not carry cards/have access to smart phones to use a parking app.

Statement: PS20.34

Cabinet – 24TH JANUARY 2023

Re: Agenda item 20 – Introduction of Pay and Display Parking for District Car Parks

Statement submitted by: Chris Queree

Your proposal to charge for parking at Westbury on Trym Family practice is not reasonable.

In an area with an elderly population access to medical care is vital. Avoiding A and E at Southmead is vital. No medical appointment lasts from car door to car door less than 30 minutes, so you are penalising people from accessing medical care.

You have also threatened the local shops whose business rates you collect. By imposing penalties upon their customers you imperil their businesses and therefore reduce your collection of council rates.

Your "solution" is no solution , it is a problem. You threaten to make it.

Chris Quérée

All through with this niceness and negotiation stuff