**Response to Consultation**

**St Peters Avenue car park**

In summary to the consultation for making **St. Peters Avenue** car park a maximum four-hour, stay the outcome of the consultation did not lean towards this happening. The ticket sales demonstrate that this is predominately a short stay car park, which question one supports. Yet the percentage of people agreeing with the proposed changes was too close.

Q1- Do you currently use this car park to park all day?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 114 | 26.57% |
| No | 315 | 73.43% |
| Total | 429 | 100% |

Q2- Do you agree to the proposed changes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 163 | 37.73% |
| No | 148 | 34.26% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 121 | 28.01% |
| Total | 432 | 100% |

Q3 – Would you use more often if it was changed to a short stay car park?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 103 | 23.20% |
| No | 193 | 43.47% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 148 | 33.33% |
| Total | 444 | 100% |

**Key comments for the proposed changes:**   
More available spaces  
Stops people visiting, as they cannot find a space.  
Might use more often if knew spaces were available lack of parking stops us visiting  
 **Key comments against the changes:**   
Workers in the avenue need to use all day.  
Optional space when Wardall Street car park is full for council employees.  
Restricts stay (lunch etc.)  
Displacement onto streets.

**Wardall Street car park**

In summary to the consultation for making **Wardall Street** car park a maximum four-hour, stay the outcome of the consultation did not lean towards this happening. The ticket sales demonstrate that this is predominately a short stay car park, which question one supports. Yet the percentage of people agreeing with the proposed changes was too close to decide.

Do you use this car park to park all day?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 74 | 17.33% |
| No | 353 | 82.67% |
| Total | 427 | 100% |

Q2- Do you agree to the proposed changes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 111 | 25.34% |
| No | 134 | 30.59% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 193 | 44.06% |
| Total | 438 | 100% |

Q3 – Would you use more often if it was changed to a short stay car park?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 57 | 12.81% |
| No | 193 | 43.37% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 195 | 43.82% |
| Total | 445 | 100% |

**Key comments for the proposed changes:**   
Would give a better chance to park as spaces will be freed up.  
No need for long-term parking alternatives.  
Car park is small and suits short stay.  
Good because it’s a struggle to park when shopping in Sea View Street

**Key comments against the changes:**   
Displacement onto streets.  
I park all day and cannot move car.  
Limits time spent in the area (shopping, dining, and walking.  
Affect trade.  
More long-term parking needed.

**Leisure Centre car park**

In summary to the consultation for making the **Leisure Centre** car park a maximum four-hour, stay the outcome of the consultation did lean towards this happening. The ticket sales demonstrate that this is predominately a short stay car park, which question one supports. The percentage of people agreeing with the proposed changes were 40% as opposed to 26% against the change.

Q1- Do you currently use this car park to park all day?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 70 | 17.24% |
| No | 336 | 82.76% |
| Total | 406 | 100% |

Q2- Do you agree to the proposed changes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 172 | 40.66% |
| No | 109 | 25.77% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 142 | 33.57% |
| Total | 423 | 100% |

Q3 – Would you use more often if it was changed to a short stay car park?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 74 | 17.29% |
| No | 181 | 42.29% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 173 | 40.42% |
| Total | 428 | 100% |

**Key comments for the proposed changes:**   
Frustrating as Lincs Inspire members, as we struggle to park on sunny days. We refuse to pay elsewhere and receive no show for classes as a result.  
More spaces for Leisure Centre users.  
Other long stay car parks available for trippers, especially in height of summer.  
Four hours is long enough.

**Key comments against the proposed changes:**   
Using gym and pool = over 4 hours  
Want it to stay as long stay.  
Not enough time.  
Put people off parking and bringing in revenue.  
Use for family days out.  
Displacement onto streets.

**Market Hall Roof car park**

In summary to the consultation for making the **Market Hall Roof car park** a maximum four-hour, stay the outcome of the consultation did not lean towards this happening. The ticket sales demonstrate that this is predominately a short stay car park, which question one supports. Yet the percentage of people agreeing with the proposed changes was too close to decide.

Q1- Do you currently use this car park to park all day?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 56 | 13.56% |
| No | 357 | 86.44% |
| Total | 413 | 100% |

Q2- Do you agree to the proposed changes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 126 | 30.14% |
| No | 104 | 24.88% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 188 | 44.98% |
| Total | 418 | 100% |

Q3 – Would you use more often if it was changed to a short stay car park?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 50 | 11.76% |
| No | 192 | 45.18% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 183 | 43.06% |
| Total | 425 | 100% |

**Key comments for the proposed changes:**   
More spaces available.  
Free up spaces for short-term visits.

**Key comments against the proposed changes:**   
Stay for longer than four hours e.g. Christmas shopping.  
Encourage to stay longer, not restrict stay.  
Not fair on those who use it to park all-day  
Do not want to be timed.

**Cartergate car park**

In summary to the consultation for making the **Cartergate car park** a maximum four-hour, stay the outcome of the consultation did not lean towards this happening. The ticket sales demonstrate that this is predominately a short stay car park, which question one supports. The percentage of people disagreeing with the proposed changes was 41% and only 21% agreed.

Q1- Do you currently use this car park to park all day?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 129 | 28.23% |
| No | 328 | 71.77% |
| Total | 457 | 100% |

Q2- Do you agree to the proposed changes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 98 | 21.83% |
| No | 187 | 41.65% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 164 | 36.53% |
| Total | 449 | 100% |

Q3 – Would you use more often if it was changed to a short stay car park?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 51 | 11.56% |
| No | 232 | 52.61% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 158 | 35.83% |
| Total | 441 | 100% |

**Key comments for the proposed changes:**   
Maybe easier to get a space so would check first before going elsewhere.  
As with St Peters car park, this is one of the only shoppers car parks at this end of town so should be short stay to enable shoppers to have a chance to park.  
Free up spaces for short-term visits.

**Key comments against the proposed changes:**   
Carpark was never used until Wilkinson Chapman moved in, which encouraged anti-social behaviour and makes the underpass dangerous to walk under in darkness.

Danger to life.  
Impact on working day as parking elsewhere which would take longer to get to work.  
Affect business owners and staff  
Four hours is not long enough.  
It would mean having to re-park every 4 hours.

**Church Lane, Humberston car park**

In summary to the consultation for making the **Church Lane car park** for a maximum two-hour stay the outcome of the consultation did lean towards this happening. The percentage of people agreeing with the proposed changes was 30% and only 14% disagreed.

Q1- Do you currently use this car park to park all day?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 25 | 5.97% |
| No | 394 | 94.03% |
| Total | 419 | 100% |

Q2- Do you agree to the proposed changes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 123 | 29.57% |
| No | 56 | 13.46% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 237 | 56.97% |
| Total | 416 | 100% |

**Key comments for the proposed changes:**   
Yes, this would free up more space.  
Easier to park as more turnover of spaces.  
Car park is always full.  
  
**Key comments against the proposed changes:**   
It would push parking onto the nearby residents streets  
No shops close by to benefit from this.  
2 hours is a little restrictive if going for lunch.

**Waltham Road Scartho car park**

In summary to the consultation for making Waltham Road car park a maximum two-hour, stay the outcome of the consultation did lean towards this happening. **The percentage of people agreeing with the proposed changes was 33%** and only 14% disagreed.

**However, we have received a late response to the consultation, from an employee in the village who is strongly against the restriction. They need to park all day and have suggested parking permits for village workers as opposed to them having to park on the nearby streets if this went ahead.**

Q1- Do you currently use this car park to park all day?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 46 | 11.19% |
| No | 356 | 88.81% |
| Total | 420 | 100% |

Q2- Do you agree to the proposed changes?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 138 | 33.09% |
| No | 59 | 14.15% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 220 | 52.76% |
| Total | 417 | 100% |

**Key comments for the proposed changes:**   
Good for shoppers.  
Free up spaces for others.  
Easier to park for the shops  
Stop people camping overnight and not contributing to the economy.  
A small fee for parking is very reasonable and would help funding.

**Key comments against the proposed changes:**   
Push problem onto neighbouring side roads.  
Due to local restrictions often visitors to locals, use this car park overnight.  
No need to change but if it does give local residents a free permit.  
Car park is for locals so should stay free.  
  
**Summary of feedback from local Cllrs**  
Cllr Harness – WC Humberston/New Waltham Supports 2 or 4 hours.  
Cllr Shreeve – WC Humberston - Preference 2 hours although has no objections for 4 hours.  
Cllr Shepherd – WC Waltham Road – Prefers 2 hours max stay. Plus no commercial vehicles overnight (HGV)  
Cllr Fenty – verbal response – 2 hour preference.  
Parish Council – Would prefer 2 hours as they feel this would be most effective (confirmation cannot renew ticket after 2 hours – re-assured they cannot).

**Marine Walk**

In summary to the consultation for closing Marine Walk car park by notice at 10pm, the outcome of the consultation leant heavily towards this happening. The percentage of people agreeing with the proposed change was 51% and only 19% disagreed.

The implementation of a seasonal parking charge agreed 36% and 29% disagreed.

Q1 - Do you agree with the possible change of closing the car park by notice at 10pm with no overnight parking permitted?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 219 | 51.05% |
| No | 79 | 18.41% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 131 | 30.29% |
| Total | 429 | 100% |

Q2 - Do you agree with the possible introduction of a seasonal parking charge?

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 157 | 36.68% |
| No | 124 | 28.97% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 147 | 34.35% |
| Total | 428 | 100% |

**Key comments for the proposed changes:**   
Stop people camping overnight and not contributing to the economy.  
Charging would help with improvements.  
Free up spaces as in the summer it is full of motor homes.  
Safer environment with night time closure stop the noise.  
Stop the motor homes and caravans parking all weekend.  
Use the money elsewhere.

**Key comments against the proposed changes:**   
It does not hurt to have somewhere to park overnight.  
Should stay free for locals.  
Discourage visitors not reduce their parking options.  
Often park due to parking restrictions elsewhere  
Locals use on a regular bases and would stop using it if charging was applied.  
  
**Season Ticket Options**

**From the outcome of the consultation, we recommend that Season Tickets be available for use on all the additional car parks below.**

**The consultation established that 37% disagreed with Season Tickets being removed from Cartergate and 27% agreed. The results for Season Tickets to be removed from the ground floor of Abbey Walk car park was 28% for and 31% against.**   
  
Q1 - Should Season Tickets be made available for the following car parks?  
  
**Boating Lake car park**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 185 | 48.05% |
| No | 82 | 21.30% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 118 | 30.65% |
| Total | 371 | 100% |

**Central Promenade car park**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 175 | 45.81% |
| No | 91 | 23.82% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 116 | 30.37% |
| Total | 382 | 100% |

**Civic Offices car park**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 166 | 43.92% |
| No | 71 | 18.678% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 141 | 37.30% |
| Total | 378 | 100% |

**Meridian Road**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 154 | 41.07% |
| No | 81 | 21.60% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 140 | 37.33% |
| Total | 375 | 100% |

**North Promenade car park**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 178 | 46.97% |
| No | 79 | 20.84% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 122 | 32.19% |
| Total | 379 | 100% |

**Thrunscoe Land car park**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 142 | 37.97% |
| No | 66 | 17.65% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 166 | 44.39% |
| Total | 374 | 100% |

**Key comments for the proposed changes:**   
Proposal seems sensible  
Opportunities to park in different car parks, so permit holders do not clog selected car parks.  
Save paying a separate fee when already a season ticket holder.  
Really good idea but not the sea front.  
Would encourage the sale of permits if all car parks were included.  
  
**Key comments against the proposed changes:**   
Not the sea front but all other areas.  
It may take up spaces for visitors.  
Save for visitors

Q2 – Should Season Tickets be removed from the following car parks?  
  
**Abbey Walk Ground Floor**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 109 | 28.91% |
| No | 119 | 31.59% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 149 | 39.52% |
| Total | 377 | 100% |

**Cartergate car park**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 103 | 26.55% |
| No | 146 | 37.63% |
| Not Sure/No Opinion | 139 | 35.82% |
| Total | 388 | 100% |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer** | **People Count** | **Percent** |
| Yes | 161 | 41.60% |
| No | 226 | 58.40% |
| Total | 387 | 100% |

**Key comments for the proposed changes:**   
Save for local shoppers.  
Free spaces for shoppers/short term parking.  
Make it more accessible for the elderly and disabled.  
No spaces as it is always full of permit holders.  
  
**Key comments against the proposed changes:**   
Workers need safe parking it is not used by shoppers.  
Would affect town workers.  
Nowhere to park for work.  
It would cost more to park every day.  
Safety concerns during dark nights.