Question 18: If you answered 'other' in question 10, please explain what changes you would like to see in order to make NPP permanent:

I'm fine with it remaining if I don't have to pay for on-street or guest parking. Otherwise, it's one more cost burden you are putting on taxpayers.

Option for additional guest passes.

Clarification on my answers to questions 8 & 9: because I know someone is trying to get crafty and sneak support for survey answers by on a flawed program by dealing in absolutes: this program should not cost anyone anything. If it can't be funded by enforcement, then it doesn't belong here in the first place. My answer here is not 'Yes' or 'No' - it's that it shouldn't exist at all. But if I must answer, Yes, charge more to homeowners with driveways for being lazy, and homeowners for complaining about parking in a place where they knew what they were getting into when they moved here.

I think this survey needed to offer broader question options to accommodate for everyone who interacted with the pilot. I don't feel like it accurately reflects my sentiments about the pilot or my experience with it. I will say that if it becomes permanent I will not be participating (if there is a fee to park). I never witnessed an issue with parking in the Islington Creek neighborhoods, and believe the residents there are not being understanding of the working community coming into town for their jobs each day. When I have lived in a city area with street parking I expected people would be parking on my street and (gasp!) even in front of my house. I would never have thought about raising it as an issue with the city. And I do not think a supremely expensive parking garage is the answer, either. Lower the price at Foundry...or make it free for businesses.

No fees to property tax payers!!!

The NPP is not necessary. The only change I would like to see is the elimination of the program.

Yes-the NPP program should be made permanent...BUT...the downtown worker program needs to remain more attractive cost-wise than this NPP permit program, otherwise they will flood out of Foundry and purchase these NPP permits. I also think this program needs to be re-evaluated on a regular basis to make adjustments when parking dynamics change such as an escalating need for more parking due to all of the new businesses moving downtown into buildings without any parking, microunits being built without on-site parking, CUPs being approved for less parking than is required by code, etc...

100% YES!

As long as the program stays as it was structured during the pilot program and Islington Street residents are included, then we can go along with it.

As long as the program stays as it was structured during the pilot program and Islington Street residents are included, then we can go along with it.
Not if there is going to be a cost. I personally never have a problem (day or night) parking near 135 McDonough St. But it was nice to feel special and have a parking permit sticker on my car!

1. NO, if we have to pay for the passes.

2. Yes, but If the property owners should not pay. maybe tenants, employees, residents outside the Islington Creek area should pay.
I answered No to question 10, but I propose that for question 9, employers pay the cost. I would love to see this city be affordable to live in and work in, please.
I don't think it should be permanent as it is. If anything, it might be helpful to narrow it down to smaller sections of the neighborhood. For example, each block or two having its own permit so the residents who live there can actually park near their house and not have to strategically plan when and how they park. I realize this may narrow down the number of available passes, but it would help decrease the number of employees who park in sections closer to town where they donâ€™t live (which takes away spaces from those who actually live there).
too restrictive, didn't make any difference in parking on the street in our experience. Process for getting passes was not easy and confusing

The program is unnecessary. City shouldn't be in business of regulating neighborhood parking. I was well aware of parking situation when I choose to move into the neighborhood. Limited parking was/is a tradeoff for the downtown location. There is plenty of parking in Rochester. I choose to live in Portsmouth!
Because of Covid, I haven't visited friends in Islington Creek as often as I have in the past, so haven't needed to use the pass much. Don't really have an opinion about the program.
Depends on cost. We don't use it that often. It's usually 2 hrs two to three times a week. Guest pass is essential. If cost is more than $100 per pass then I would rather not have the program.
Parking is harder to find than before the permits started.

The change in demand for parking should be re-evaluated. Also, I would like to see reassessment of which neighborhoods are considered for this program. Maybe there are other parts of the city that would actually benefit.

As someone with no driveway and 2 kids, if I don't support the program then I don't understand who this program is really for. If there are elderly or disabled residents then yes, they should have a special designated parking space.

Not permanent at at more than a nominal fee. $5.00 is acceptable.

I do think the program could allow for more permits per household if needed and more guests passes. I also think there is room for businesses to make any necessary requests. I am sure there are issues that arose for people that could be addressed with adjustments. I have learned through this process being inclusive of businesses and Islington Street was a positive decision. Those invested parties may see an increased need for permits. There may be an easier way to accommodate for contractors as well.

Pilot should continue during summer months of 2022

It is NOT the city's problem to deal with residential parking. Everyone who moves into the area knows the parking situation. Everyone who lives in the neighborhood CHOSE to live here. Every location has a cost/benefit and limited parking is one of those costs for living downtown. Plowing and maintain the streets it the city's responsibility. How about you start trying to do that?? Parking is the resident's responsibility; not the city's.

It should be tweaked and then made permanent. The prices should be tenants/businesses and property owners in Islington Creek one price and all others including other Portsmouth residents should pay a little more than Foundry Garage.

No parking program. Greedy neighbors trying to control the property of others.

Also the city never plows or clears our sidewalks on my street. Or any other street off islington street.

Even more enforcement.

Too soon to tell

I am ambivalent because I am not sure how successful it was.

I'm fine with the parking program in areas where it's needed, like Hanover Street and maybe the east end of McDonough Street. Residents already pay a lot in property taxes versus tenants paying nothing in property, income or sales tax so I think maybe tenants should pay a little more for the program. Also people without driveways will be using the program every single day so should probably have to pay a little more for the program than people with driveways who donâ€™t use it as much.

Only if adjustments are made to the program. As a resident we have already paid parking fine on our own cars because we do not have enough passes. Just recently we were informed a building on Cromwel was awarded more than three passes! This is not equitable and already the program is tantated! If there are not enought passes for All Residents in one house and the pass is too expensive I do not want it! I would rather fight for my parking again!

Keep it free and give passes to all resident not business with cars at the address.

Only if you make it free and residents not business get more passes for the people who live in the house.

Yes, I do believe the program is working as intended, but, there are a few tweaks that could be made. $225 is way too much to be asking when revenue can easily be made if area is patrolled properly. Businesses should not be given parking passes for owners, managers or other employees as it takes spaces away from residents (it is a resident parking program) or taking space away to steadily turn over parking for those businesses customers. That Is, unless the owner or employees live there of course, then that makes them residents. Window sticker passes shouldnâ€™t be limited to a specific number as some households could have 4 drivers (2 parents and 2 teens) or possibly more. No passes for trailerâ€™s or mopeds though.

Yes, if the city realizes fees are unjustified.

Tenants are being priced out of the area with condos and town houses going in, relatively low wages of the state, and general housing prices, making it difficult to afford extra costs in the current economic climate.

I am hesitant to answer yes or no to this question as I feel there are a lot of issues with the program in it's current iteration. A high personal fee for tenants such as my self working barely above recommended minimum wage in addition to the current economic climate feels a bit extortionist. Otherwise while the program has significantly reduced congestion on residential streets during weekends and some afternoons, the issue of short term visitors clogging street parking during business hours remains am issue.

My main concern lies with the lack of frank and upfront communication from the beginning of this program. I feel like regulations and criteria were difficult to obtain in some instances, particularly for tenants. In addition to an unannounced fee at the end of the pilot program which puts an additional strain on single tenants and working families in the neighborhood. I feel like this program was designed from the start to cater to a particular demographic of resident and ignores the real issues of a lack of affordable parking in the city for residents and commuters alike.

I can only speak for Dover st, and the answer is No, it's not needed, and to have someone this far down enforcing something that isn't needed is a waste of resources.

Only if there is no cost

I have one guest pass, and most of the time that's sufficient. There are, however, 2 or 3 days a month when I need about 3. If I were given 3 guest passes, I can assure you that I'd almost never use more than one. As it is, I use my only guest pass about 2-3 days a week, and never Friday through Sunday. Perhaps there should be a provision for program participants to have a 'customized' permit situation. The categories are overly broad and don't take into account the uniqueness of some residents' and tenants' situations.

Islington creek

And other areas (south end, parrot Ave etcâ€¦) should all benefit from resident (city resident) parking with additional neighborhood permits.

Keep the number of permits at a limit

I don't think a parking plan is a bad idea, but it needs to help its residents. It needs to be clear and have open communication. Other cities do have success. Thank you for taking these answers under consideration. I will be looking for the plan mentioned in the meeting.

Resident only parking. No 2 hour parking for non residents. There are simply not enough spaces for this especially on Hanover street.

Possibly but with enforcement

If parking without a permit was enforced with a ticket that would be best

If free, yes. In an already expensive town to live in with ample ways for portsmouth to make money (i.e. parking garage, etc.), there shouldnâ€™t be a cost to the permit. Seems a bit opportunistic to me, giving the residents no other option but to pay to park on the street they live on.

Given to Residents:
- One parking pass per Islington Creek Neighborhood resident.
- One guest pass given to each household/address.

Ability to purchase:
- Additional parking passes available for purchase at an elevated rate, but ONLY to residents.

NO outside buy-in:
- Again, do NOT let people who live in other neighborhoods or areas of the city buy or obtain permits. This defeats the purpose of a program that, on paper, touts itself as a benefit for the people who live IN the neighborhood.

Continue:
- Contractor permits (may need review, but the concept is good)

Review/Discuss:
- Driveways/off-street parking - what should count as eligible for a pass, and what shouldn't? Where is the line drawn? (all residences should receive a guest pass regardless).

Greater Enforcement:
- Numerous people have taken advantage of the limited man-power to cover the entire city, which means that if the program is implemented, there MUST be greater enforcement, not just if the NPP is put into place.

To top everything off, since the implementation of the NPP, and the way it has been managed, I believe it would be advisable to table the program and see how the neighborhood parking fairs during the summer months now that the city and businesses are closer to operating like normal. It's a complicated issue, that absolutely needs to be addressed, but the implementation, execution, and oversight must be re-examined before committing further resources towards an issue that isn't nearly as clear as anyone would like it to be.