

| Permit Type/Area | OBJECT/SUPPORT | REASONS |
|------------------|----------------|---|
| Torcross | object | Not a solution as local residents and businesses park as essential part of living not a luxury. Should bring back the weekly ticket. Residents cant afford increase but would be forced to so would not free up spaces. No places to visit if no businesses. Should look to seasonal solution. Lack of public transport in the area. Need to amend the list the permits are valid within |
| Torcross | object | increase too high. Need seasonal changes rather than penalise all year round businesses and residents. Many couldn't afford so we would loose out. |
| Torcross/leisure | object | increase extortionate. Increase visitors applauded mustn't forget local here in winter. Removing leisure permit means residents wont be able to afford to use leisure centre. Total disregard and disrespect to residents |
| Torcross | objects | residents who comply restrictions penalised again. Permits very expensive |
| Torcross | objects | Torcross very rural therefore unfair to compare torcross to other towns. Think price increase extortionate |
| Torcross | object | increase charges is false economy. Torcross pay for staff permits as no where else can park. Local live all year round and contribute to economy |
| Torcross | object | Torcross - effects residents and businesses. Not luxury but essential for those don't have purpose built parking. Cannot just facilitate visitors. |
| Torcross | object | Torcross - understands frustration for visitors but not a problem all year. Has business in Torcross supports 3 staff and 2 of their cars and couldn't afford cost of parking. Worried effect long term sustainability of business |
| Torcross | object | increase effect residents and business owners who purchase permits. Not luxury necessity. Should be protecting them as serve area. Not enough parking in local area in summer need to consider p& r |
| Torcross | objects | thinks torcross residents should park for free as per previous lease. Doesn't support community, creating a reliance on holiday homes |
| Modbury | objects | understand reasons in large towns but not small like Modbury when car park only 25% full. Increase only push on street |
| Modbury | objects | unacceptable and unaffordable. Car park never full |
| Modbury | objects | live central Modbury with no parking. Thinks rise unjustified and unfair. Always space in poundwell meadow car park. This may move vehicle onto streets which already congested. Would accept small rise but not this much |
| Modbury | object | Poundwell carpark doesn't have a problem sufficient parking for all. Purchased permit 18 years and never had difficulty finding a space. Residents are fluid in their movement so always space for visitors. Residents Modbury purchase permit do contribute to the alleviating parking problems on street. Residents permit doesn't suit needs of all so not fit for purpose. Residents support economy all year round and not just 3-4 months of year. Increase from £140 to £240 totally unreasonable and unfair. Any increase should be gradual and affordable. |
| Modbury | object | unacceptably high no relation inflation or local conditions in Modbury,. Never full ample space. Result in on street parking issues. Many locals don't have parking facilities and shouldn't be penalised |

| | | |
|------------------|---------|---|
| Modbury | object | may deter future purchases of properties in Modbury, put pressure on roads, thinks not necessary as not high levels of tourism and always spaces in the car park. Would welcome discussion on alternatives |
| Modbury | object | Doesn't think price increase will solve problem. Modbury always has spaces whereas roads clogged and this will make it worse. Thinks residents permit should go back to £10. Car parks underused on Sunday and should be free to residents |
| Modbury | objects | If increased then DYL need removing outside their house as couldn't afford permit and is 68. Always lots of spaces. Not everyone has parking or garage. |
| Modbury | objects | Elderly people cant afford permits. More cars will park on st |
| Modbury | objects | staggering price rise. Overflow Modbury rarely full. Parking been taken away all over Modbury where else can they park car. People ill afford and making lives stressful |
| Modbury | objects | family have no parking. Huge rise not justified or fair. Always space in overflow car park. Force residents onto crowded streets. Understand small rise but not this much |
| Modbury | objects | No choice to buy permit as used to have on st parking which now been removed. Doubling price is disgusting and people cant afford it. Car park rarely full. Feel taking prob of Dartmouth and Salcombe to residents who have no choice to use permit. |
| Modbury/ Bigbury | objects | car park Modbury never full even in summer and lot homes no parking so no choice use car park. Price encourage park on street. Bigbury price increase beyond comprehension. Very elitist and many on limited income |
| Bigbury | object | Bigbury - increase equates 600% blatant profiteering |
| Bigbury | object | should written to permit holders to inform of proposal. How can justify increase. Price locals out who contribute local economy. Go Bigbury in winter and uses café etc. If price increase wont visit Bigbury |
| Bigbury | object | charges ridiculously high |
| Bigbury | object | parking spaces less available in summer holidays and rest of year quiet. Why not reduce price for 10mth of year sept-June to free up spaces |
| Bowling permit | object | older people need to keep fit and healthy and this will stop people visiting |
| Bowling permit | object | permit been available 17 seasons. Ruin health benefits and loss income leisure centre. Mainly used in winter months when plenty of space |
| Bowling permit | object | bowls club joined with council to enable quayside pool to built. If permit go will discourage members from playing and eliminating exercise and social contact. Will loose fees and permit fees as result. |
| Bowling permit | object | Bowling permit - cruel blow to pensioners. Important people social life and safe exercise and those limited mobility. If pay at metre to expensive to play |
| Ivybridge | support | Ivybridge permits are too cheap should be priced to deter car use and not encourage. Should match or exceed stagecoach weekly/monthly bus ticket |

| | | |
|-------------------|---------|--|
| Ivybridge | object | Need to keep permit accessible for workers and pricing people out will be negative for Ivybridge. Supermarket taking long stay spaces. Push people on street which already congested. Taking long stay spaces will effect businesses. |
| Ivybridge/Leisure | object | increase in population and no increase in parking spaces issue. This time of year 20% full. States subjective and not supported by evidence. Short term future Leonards rd. not yet known so unreasonable to withdraw when don't know what regime will be with supermarket. Increase in permits too high and increase cost will force members to other centres eg Dinnaton which has free parking having negative impact on leisure centre |
| Dartmouth | object | massive impact on being able to uphold position within NHS in Dartmouth. Lives stoke Fleming limited public transport. Makes impossible for role to continue and huge impact on disposable income. Summer months impossible to park as taken up holiday rental. Should block these permits and make use p&r |
| Dartmouth | object | staff live far beyond walking distance unable to work at surgery if prices increase. Staff essential to community. Tragedy to leave job cos of parking |
| Dartmouth | object | object price increase. Permit should made available resident of Dartmouth and surrounding area to specific distance. Need work towards residents parking only in centre in summer. P&R should be max in summer and enhanced. Currently roundabout situation increases emission and increased health risk. Should engage town council and DTT |
| Dartmouth | support | think all visitor permit should be banned during day. Ban motor home parking on the front of Dartmouth and allow daily visitors and local to park in centre |
| Dartmouth | object | resident with 6mth permit. It change makes impossible to live here. Will make Dartmouth ghost town |
| Dartmouth | object | use p&r and keep car park for locals. Disgrace how we treat locals |
| Dartmouth | object | permits need to be reduced but should be to the vast holiday homes making difficult for residents and staff. Mayors Ave full holiday home permits. Current situation has caused problems for staff who are stressed and late impacting on patients. Have a duty of care to patients. Losing town population and workforce due to town constantly being given to tourists and no thought those that live and work here |
| Dartmouth | object | No consideration residents of Dartmouth & Salcombe on tight budgets. Unbalanced where visitors prioritised to residents. Propose visitors forced to p&r. How will town cope 500 new homes. Could consider car free locations |
| Dartmouth | support | agrees to link permit prices to charges. May change when health centre built. What about charging based on emissions? |
| Dartmouth | objects | Why not provide residents parking around Market Sq., Victoria Rd and unrestricted areas in Dartmouth. No parking near house and need somewhere to park. Provide motorhome spaces x6 by TIC |
| Dartmouth | objects | No parking in the town even when has a permit. Need to refine who gets them and make more use of p&r. Need to be affordable and usable for those live and work in Dartmouth |

| | | |
|-----------|---------|---|
| Dartmouth | objects | work for medical centre. No guarantee to space even though pay lot money. Increase is diabolical for staff on relatively low wage. Staff work 8 hours providing essential service particularly Covid. Avoids town as so hard to park. Need encourage tourism but need to remember locals |
| Dartmouth | objects | Lived in Dartmouth since 1987. Town car park filled with holiday home permits so residents don't have anywhere to park. Should look to make on street residents parking zones outside houses to free up spaces. Local community always placed at bottom of barrel. |
| Dartmouth | objects | travel 15 miles to work, parking on embankment is a joke and should have parking meters. Oct-may embankment blocked so visitors drive in and out. Permit prices go up but spaces taken up for events etc. Price gone up but value gets less and only can have one vehicle reg. If want people to use p&r need to be more efficient and work longer hours and have more buses |
| Dartmouth | objects | Lives in Dartmouth has no off st parking. Relies on permit. Feels residents are poorly served and come third to business and visitors. Dartmouth would be empty without residents out of season. If permit reduced then should allocate annual permits to full time residents first on a one permit per household. If this case would accept increase. If want more short stay parking need to improve p&r. Annual permit for resident no parking is essential not luxury so need be reasonable cost |
| Dartmouth | objects | On st parking not right balance in the town. Should intro on st residents permit scheme. Need to enhance p&r. Need to take care of locals first as without them wouldn't be any business etc. Motorhomes should be banned from the home and parking along embankment. Winter residents use mayors aver and without that wouldn't have as much income |
| Dartmouth | objects | totally unfair to full time residents. 70% permits one evening had business permits. They are too cheap and should be in excess £4k. Could lower time to max stay 2 hours for pay & display allowing locals change to get in for medical appointments etc. Residents permit not effective and blocks working people parking. |
| Dartmouth | objects | Mayors Ave long stay car park for holiday lets. Difficult to park for work, medical centre. Need to restrict overnight stays and get use P&R to free up spaces in town for residents, day visitors and workers. Price increase only effects local residents and workers therefore putting jobs at risk. Should increase in line with inflation and not large increase proposed. Don't have regular reliable transport. On st parking too unrestricted in winter and too restricted in summer. Need review embankment. Need to look at ev charging in town |
| Dartmouth | objects | residents and workers in businesses will suffer more than business permits due to difference in increase. Business can offset against income. Half car park used by business permits blocking spaces. Need to restrict numbers issued and ensure business permit holders use p&R between march - oct and mayors ave in other times . Needed joined up approach with DCC and need residents on st permit scheme |

| | | |
|-------------|-----------------|--|
| Dartmouth | objects | uplift in price extortionate and doesn't guarantee space. Proposal will stop local workers getting to work and will mean businesses close. P&R not included in permit. Should be like mevagissy and not allow parking other than residents and workers and all tourist use p&r |
| Dartmouth | objects | employ 30 people surrounding area who cant walk to work. Currently pay heavily to fight for parking in town. Need to expand P&R |
| Dartmouth | objects | The circling sharks of tourist going round can understand problem but thinks other way to reduce numbers. Could reduce those to second homes and holiday rentals to p&r only. Residents permits and leisure are only ones to benefit local living in sh and therefore strongly encourages to keep affordable. Thinks penalising residents who support in winter if not ghost town. If income should look to second home owners |
| Dartmouth | objects | residents who don't have parking its critical. Dartmouth relatively isolated and car essential. Proposal blatant profiteering and attack on venerable residents. Force cars to outer lying areas causing congestion 2nd home reliant on car park and bring in income to town need to have permit for out of season and enhance P&R for peak season. Business permit should allocate places on p&r only use mayors ave in winter. Need more signs directing to park & ride. Coronation park could be used for pay & display |
| Dartmouth | objects | Born bred in Dartmouth no option buy permit as no where else to park. Car park not taken up by residents but 65% holiday homes. Holiday Home permits should be least £3000. They should park at P&R and free up spaces for locals who don't earn enough to pay the price rise. Car essential in Dartmouth. Should enhance P&R and residents permits stopped. Town will die without local living here. |
| Dartmouth | objects | Would like residents permit changed to 10.30 as shops opening later. |
| Dartmouth | objects | disgusted at increase. Wages not increasing by 20/40%. Trying run local out of work in Dartmouth |
| Dartmouth | object | if goes ahead no option but to sell home and leave area. Need consideration for full time residents supporting town all year round. |
| Dartmouth | support/objects | Thinks permits should not be available for use in this car park but using price alienates majority of residents and only rich 2nd home owners benefit. Thinks should direct to p&r and enhance service |
| Dartmouth | support/objects | has residents permit but constantly full by holiday homes. They should only be valid at p&r not town centre car park to help day visitors and residents or convert coronation park to car park |
| Dartmouth | objects | disrespectful to full time residents. They are lifeblood of town. Need on street permit parking. This would free up spaces in car park. Thinks money making scheme to council and no benefit to locals. |
| Dartmouth | objects | Need to effectively manage on street enforcement. Should allow residents to park not visitors - permit times 6pm-9pm for residents |
| Kingsbridge | support | doesn't expect much of a discount verses the daily fees |

| | | |
|--------------------|---------|--|
| Kingsbridge | objects | no time lack of spaces in quay or cattlemarket. Penalising residents who don't have access to car parking spaces. Should increase parking cost in peak holiday season for tourist and increase business permit. Second home owners should pay more in council tax. Cant afford increase. |
| Kingsbridge | objects | impact on business who just returning back to work. Rely on car to come to work in Kingsbridge. Increase higher than inflation |
| Kingsbridge | objects | make on street problem even worse |
| Kingsbridge | objects | Not enough space in car park and fore st not option wouldn't mind paying more for this but current system unfair |
| Kingsbridge | objects | Would like weekly tickets reintroduced. Preferred having more car parks to park in for higher price. Would like to see resident permit retained |
| Kingsbridge | objects | Challenge to recruit to posts compared to Plymouth and Bristol due to remoteness. They provide permits and this is often tipping point for attracting employees to Totnes and Kingsbridge. Employee 60 who use local garages, shops, supermarkets and local businesses need to support high st all year round |
| Kingsbridge | objects | proposal seeks create more spaces for visitors for 4 months of year and not protect locals. Parking so expensive in area. Lack free parking on fore st is problem so cant nip in shops. Don't earn enough wage to pay for permits. Taking away leisure permits is taking away fitness. new policy misguided and do more damage to locals struggling. |
| Kingsbridge | objects | concern about raising cost. Local business people cannot rely on public transport and need flexibility. Local business people underpin local economy. Business owners and employees contribute to local economy. Hard to recruit in rural areas if limited/prohibited parking. Permits are a necessity. Don't understand why want to give priority to visitors when employees, business and full time residents should have priority to ensure long term continuation of thriving towns. Should look at reserve bays that are used by second home owners |
| Kingsbridge | objects | appalled. Want to free up spaces but refuse to look after those that drive commerce all year round. Kingsbridge not Salcombe. If take parking away they will go elsewhere. Need to identify permanent residents of Kingsbridge and offer lower rate. second home /holiday homes pay higher rate. Could band sections of car park eg keep one area for visors and non permit holders, could find alternative car park to build. |
| Kingsbridge/Totnes | objects | catering holiday makers not locals. Not encouraging to work local. |
| Kingsbridge | objects | doesn't have anywhere else to park. Quay rarely full. Car parks not well maintained. Think should get cheaper rate |
| Kingsbridge | objects | not all residents have parking. Issue for only 6 weeks of year whereas local shop for rest. Without residents town will die. Meddling something that isn't a problem and pushing people out of towns |
| Kingsbridge | objects | single, one car on low income. Summer already challenging for locals without increasing price. Stop punishing locals. |
| Kingsbridge | objects | Thinks unfair on residents to favour tourist. Could we not provide privilege cards for residents offering reduced parking, preserve 30 min free on fore st and source new parking area |

| | | |
|-------------|---------|--|
| Kingsbridge | objects | feels only few key weekends it applies that the car parks at capacity and wants to see evidence for our assumptions. Feels increasing permits or restricting will not incentivise locals to spend money and will be pushed out to residential areas. Wants to see further research and thinks those residents with no off st parking should have 24/7 residents permit to encourage to stay and shop in the town. |
| Kingsbridge | objects | Resident of Kingsbridge see no shortage of parking. Never seen all car parks full creating a barrier to visitors. Have no parking so need permit. Unacceptable to inflict above inflation hike on permanent residents who have no alternative to buy permit. Shouldn't have one size fits all approach. In Dartmouth/Salcombe imbalance between demand and parking. Although businesses important shouldn't forget locals who pay council tax, support business all year round etc. believes burden should fall to visitors and business who benefit from visitors not local residents |
| Kingsbridge | objects | Fore St residents cannot park outside home. Permit system allows local to not pay tourist visitor rate current increase is too high especially when no choice but to park in car park. Wages low. Lower union rd. rarely full As permit don't guarantee space supplement p&d income. Fair system would be allocate permanent residents reduced rates. No direct contact from SHDC regarding proposal. Doesn't effectively manage car parks. Puts burden on street. If go ahead will effect health of town, services, club, community and general ethos of town. People will not live in streets with no parking so will remain empty |
| Kingsbridge | objects | too high increase. Shdc will kill shopping in towns. Need to build more car parks |
| Kingsbridge | objects | inflationary price rise acceptable but not 19-22%. Seems revenue exercise without soldiering alternative. Local residents and key workers bear burden of cost. Many people live in area make no financial benefit from visitors to area. Lack empathy with residents. MP evidence available show spaces aren't available for parking. Would like meet members and officer to discuss review before public meeting called for. |
| Kingsbridge | objects | parking chaotic and inefficient many years. Raising permits do nothing to help apart from make money for council. Locals must have priority as many houses without parking and poor public transport. Make a volatile situation far worse |
| Leisure | objects | should promote exercise. Too expensive for parking and membership propose should just increase price |
| Leisure | objects | plenty of space for visitors, discouraging exercise. More space if move recycling bins |
| Leisure | objects | vital to leisure centre. No other car park near by. Thinks will be end to centre. Sometimes cant park but would still require a permits |
| Leisure | objects | quay never full capacity. Using centre brings people into the town to shop. Discourage using sports centre jeopardising its future |
| Leisure | objects | bowling club and council joined together to create pool on agreement of parking. When developing the quay we didn't have issue with permits. Leisure brings people in 44 weeks of year. This will supress this |
| Leisure | objects | Don't remove leisure permits. Stop the parking on the South Embankment |

| | | |
|----------|---------|--|
| Leisure | objects | permit encourages use of centre in area of insufficient public transport. Capacity in quay and cattlemarket rarely reached. Jeopardise leisure centre |
| leisure | object | price increase shocking. Removal leisure permit makes using centre unaffordable |
| leisure | objects | Throughout summer plenty spaces available |
| Salcombe | objects | Need parking for everyone not just day trippers. Need p&r run by SHDC. Price only effects local people. |
| business | objects | increase extortionate. Salcombe relies on tourism and therefore business rely on business permits. Wont free up space just give more money. Mean more park on residential streets |
| Salcombe | object | on residents permit scheme ineffective. Removing p&r makes mockery of situation. Council could create separate tourist class permit for Salcombe and Dartmouth which only valid in those towns would help small businesses to park |
| Salcombe | object | Too many permits given to 2nd home owners. Need alternative on outside of town. Reserved permits are joke as empty most of year |
| Salcombe | object | Need consideration full time residents in Salcombe. Works on water everyday with tools . Struggling to keep paying parking when business doesn't pay much. Need special local rates |
| Salcombe | support | As long as people work in Salcombe can still get permit it will be fine |
| Salcombe | object | Doesn't understand reasons for increase and Salcombe and Dartmouth always higher than elsewhere. Even though only renewals still be at higher amount for those often on lower salaries. Should look at reducing number of permits per household. Peak time could reduce boats to have more parking. Businesses were upset. Would not be able recruit staff in area. |
| Salcombe | object | increase cost no effect on 2nd home owners who just pass to customer. Drive few residents away from Salcombe. Better solution is rental and 2nd home owners use p&r freeing up spaces. Unfair tax on those who keep heart of town alive with many on min wage |
| Salcombe | object | price increase extortionate and over inflation. Need overhaul residents parking specifically second homes. They should be encourage to park elsewhere to free up space in town |
| Salcombe | object | concern about raising cost. Local business people cannot rely on public transport and need flexibility. Local business people underpin local economy. Business owners and employees contribute to local economy. Hard to recruit in rural areas if limited/prohibited parking. Permits are a necessity. Don't understand why want to give priority to visitors when employees, business and full time residents should have priority to ensure long term continuation of thriving towns. Should look at reserve bays that are used by second home owners |
| general | objects | reducing permit makes no difference. How many car parks does one town need. Leisure permits will effect those who want to get fit. Salcombe and Dartmouth overly busy in high season and cant manage numbers. Towns are oversubscribed. Our suggestions are unreasonable |

| | | |
|-----------------|----------|--|
| general | objects | permits should only be issued to local addresses who live permanently in area. Also those who work in towns. Also issuing more permits than available should stop. Its not a cash cow |
| general | objects | terrible idea when residents have no choice to park elsewhere |
| general | objects | Shouldn't be increased. Hard for employees coming to work. Should be helping towns by offering free parking |
| general | objects | Problem not to do with permits but not enough parking available for residents and visitors. Need additional parking. |
| general | objects | would like to see weekly ticket for visitors who spend a lot of money in the area and should have hassle free parking. |
| general | objects | raising price of permit doesn't create more spaces. If permit holders are workers there will be no shops for visitors to go to so no car park income |
| general | objects | is making system fairer a way of making money for council. Parking problem in towns in SG is the attraction of the area to visitors and that will never change. Only way to improve is create more spaces. Why punish people who live and work here |
| general | objects | suggests to limit number of permits rather than the cost |
| general | object | understand importance of having enough spaces but tourist just spend few hours however residents rely on permits if no parking, work in towns and provide the shops visitors come to see. Increasing will make residents rethink living in town thus creating surge 2nd homes. Communities would become ghost towns. |
| general | object | could not consider weekly tourist pass for non residents help support economy |
| general/leisure | object | shockingly misguided plan. Removing leisure and bowling extraordinary idea when in interest of wellbeing. Permits help town thrive all year round. Should be reduced not increased for residents |
| general/leisure | object | leisure permit vital mental health and well being. If pay each time to park makes unaffordable to do having adverse effect on family. Permit price increase too high |
| general | object | all about visitors. Nightmare to park and think local people and those that work should have cheaper permits |
| general | objects | increase wrong when we continue to approve houses with no parking. Not fair resident with no parking should have prices linked to visitor day rate. Jobs have low salaries so unfair expect pay charges. Kingsbridge working town doesn't close in winter. raise fees for visitors who don't contribute not residents. Leisure and bowlers good for health and social lives ruin for getting more money for visitors. Leisure could be restricted to 2 hours. Don't need to encourage tourists as come anyway. Need help local people. Reserved bays always empty as wealthy 2nd home owner spaces. This should not be used as cash cow. |
| general | objects | people get paid pennies down here and we want to increase cost. Disgusting |
| general | supports | fine with proposal but would like to see more ev charge points |

| | | |
|------------------|---------|---|
| general | objects | Thinks permits should remain and there should be dedicated permit car parks. Price of pay & display and permits should be in the middle. Cutting number of permits will drive people away and there will be no worn or shops to visit |
| general | objects | residents must get priority |
| general | objects | careful not to kill the golden calf. If too expensive will make difficult for those live in adjacent to town will suffer as wont be able to park on the street. Shops will suffer as will park where free parking. |
| general | objects | without ability local residents to park will be no visitors as wont be able to get to jobs. Right to park near house |
| residents permit | objects | no parking at home. Not taking up space of shoppers. Better to not increase fee but hours available. |
| Totnes | objects | sizable sum for low income earners. Work long hours so public transport is not feasible. Car parks needed to enable us to travel to work |
| Totnes | objects | limited parking in Totnes only fri and sat when market. Heaths nursery and heath way only 50% occupied sun-Thurs. Price increase may deter some but doesn't solve problem for insufficient parking bays. Should acquire dairy crest site for parking. Have a p&R at follaton on sat |
| Totnes | objects | residents contribute more economy than visitors in more sustained way. Parking already challenging residents |
| Totnes | objects | residents need permit valid in any car. Pedestrianize high st and bring in more on st resident areas |
| Totnes | objects | objects as its inflationary and discriminatory. Unable to park on own land so no alternative to use car park. Believes favour casual visitor when residents contribute to council tax, shops ect |
| Totnes | objects | on st residents scheme narrow areas where people park pushing into car parks even though areas vacant as residents at work. P&R scheme would help issue. Businesses are outnumbered by residents and visitors and treated as though voice doesn't matter. |
| Totnes | objects | Need park Totnes each day and no option to have permit. Locals keep town running and we will ruin high street. Hard to keep people employed on high St. Not appropriate time to review issue. Duty to provide facilities to provide services in town |
| Totnes | object | 15 years ago middas build homes and to compensate was to build deck car park in nursery - not fulfilled agreement which would be solution |
| Totnes | objects | Permit only option as business owner in town as commutes in and makes deliveries and collections to customers. Proposal flawed and mean permit not affordable questioning viability of town. No reliable public transport. Wont create extra spaces just increase revenue. Need a p&r in Totnes |
| Totnes | objects | Only works 2 days a week and has to pay more to park in Totnes |