Question 7: Other reasons you did not like the program?

My employees have still received tickets despite having permits or guest passes.

My restaurant workers had to park in our lot taking away from customers. Our restaurant has been in the neighborhood for over 10 years. Our workers should be able to park in the neighborhood if they work here.

As I mentioned above, I didn't feel strongly one way or the other about the program.
Also, none of the above applied to me but where it was a required question I had to choose something.
See above.

I never had difficulty parking before the program. The only difference now is that having clients at our office for long meetings is complicated now and really difficult if it's last-minute.

Again, answer checked above because I'm forced to.

This program, from a Rockingham Street resident's perspective, has changed literally nothing about my ability to park or not park on this street, and only created the hassle of going to get the permit, making sure my guests use the guest permit, etc. There was never an issue here and making it one seems like an immense waste of resources. In fact, the additional policing in the beginning of enforcing 72-hour limits was downright annoying, considering it's easy to park in the same spot several days a week. Yes, I know this is a city ordinance - but as a renter, this is the only place we *can* park, and saying you're issuing tickets for this in a pandemic when we *should* be staying home is mind-boggling.

I've lived here since 2017 and have never once not been able to find on-street parking feet from my front door. I just don't see the need for this. From this end of town, it seems like a circular exercise in justifying its own existence by writing more tickets.

Again, the above question didn't provide the right answers for my situation. I do not like the program because it creates barriers to parking for individuals who work on Islington Street. There was no issue with daytime work day parking prior to the pilot which was evident anytime I looked at the streets. Now, people park all over State Street, Summer Street, etc. and that doesn't seem like a fair result just so some homeowners can have empty spaces in front of their homes all day long.

The pending fees.

It was not necessary, the data clearly showed this. It was too difficult to get one day party permits. Friends who live in other parts of Portsmouth were told they couldnâ€™t get a parking permit.

(1) I'd like to see the max # of permits tied to the # of verified residents living in a home rather than a set number to accommodate those homes with more than 3 residents. (2) I'd like to see 2 guest permits/residence rather than just 1 (3) The current Contractor Permit program could be greatly improved. When building a house or doing a major renovation during which multiple sub-contractors need to be at your house at the same time, asking them to park their vehicles (which have all their electrical, plumbing, carpentry tools and materials in them) in the garage is not practical. I'd ask you to revisit this contrctor program to make it friendlier to contractors that need to have their vehicles nearby to do their jobs. Thanks.

This is dramatically better than in the past. However, I still see people parking for far longer than 2 hours, without a ticket.

Although the above does not truly apply to me, I do not care for having to pay for permits in the future and believe if the program was not put in place that we would be able to find parking spots in the neighborhood without causing undue hardship for anyone living in the neighborhood. We have a problem with parking only because our city street parking on Islington Street is limited because it is limited to one side and also limited to 2 hours during daytime hours.
It is not organized at all, I registered and I get tickets, 0 sense in this program, I donâ€™t think this program is needed at all.
Although the above response does not truly apply to me, I do not want to pay for permits in the future and believe if the program is not put in place that we would be able to find parking spots in the neighborhood without causing undue hardship for anyone living in the neighborhood. We have a problem with parking only because our city street parking on Islington Street is limited to one side and also limited to 2 hours during daytime hours.

It's all so very inconvenient

Parking meter people were not able to check cars every 2 hrs to monitor the 2hr limits on my street.

Seemed like on some days, cars without passes were parked on my street and were never checked. But, I don't know for sure.
No need for it, since it was equally easy to find parking before the NPP.
Ther's still limited parking throughout the day so we have to be strategic for when we park or move our cars. My roommate had a lot of trouble getting the permit, needing 4 different pieces of proof. I feel like theyâ€™ve policed the neighborhood heavily lately when they never did before, which probably increases the costs.
It was a bit difficult to get approved, and it still appears a lot of cars that park there are employees or visitors, not residents. During the day itâ€™s nearly impossible to get a spot (unless you park before

8:30), and only at nights is it easier to find a spot. I would not say I can always find parking by any means.

I don't mind people occasionally using the neighborhood to park for a trip downtown, but if we paid a fee I would probably want that to stop to increase the likelihood of getting parking near my residence.

Enforcement seems lax. The end time is too early. With a two hour limit, that means non NPP cars can start parking at 6PM and not have to worry about a ticket. I think it should run until 8PM to coincide with the meter and lot times (which are just around the corner from me0.

Too many people thst do not live in the neighborhood have permits. That, in my mind, defeats the purpose

too restrictive for use outside of standard parking. Very difficult to allow short term contractors to work with no special circumstances allowed

I only checked a box here because the program wouldn't let me hit "submit" until I picked one. I think the program works fine as-is.

All on street parking should be 1st come 1st serve and free!

I have lived and worked in this neighborhood for over 12 years. There was never that big a problem in the first place. This is a waste of time and taxpayer dollars. Just because you have a house here does not mean you own the street. This is more an issue about entitlement and the solution creates a greater burden on the less wealthy. It was a terrible, short-sighted idea from the start.

I walked through the neighborhood throughout the pilot and regularly saw a bunch of open spaces. It appeared to me as underutilized parking in what should be a thriving part of the city. I noticed less people and vibrancy in the area.

It's unnecessary, it makes our neighborhood less vibrant, it's a pain to deal with parking permits. The money we're spending to run this program could be better utilized elsewhere.

I don't feel it is needed. Too much paperwork for something that was being managed on its own. Folks who live in the neighborhood know where and when to park.

I believe that this was/is an unnecessary burden on taxpayers with an outcome that benefits the affluent while punishing the poorer working-class people within this area. It has been a waste of time and resources with little signs of any difference in the outcome, let alone an improvement.

I did not have trouble parking before the program was launched.

The program seems unnecessary, at least in my part of the neighborhood. We lived here for about 6 months before the program started and I would not have described having difficulty finding parking on my block. I know the pandemic has changed things and I don't think there is enough demand for parking here to warrant such a program. Who is benefiting?

I also think the diversity of the neighborhood is negatively impacted. If only residents can park here then we are encouraging a homogenous place where outsiders are not welcome.

I also think this is related to a perception that not enough people are using the Foundry garage. I think this program should not be a way to solve for that. Create other incentives for people to use that garage. Or accept that the use of that garage is lower than expected.

Enforcement was minimal.
Not sure where they got the sticker but obviously do not live here.

There are not enough passes for my employees.

I will say that the number of people parking in my neighborhood then walking downtown has decreased.
Interesting you add a 'no reasons' for not liking the program, however, not a similar option for why you like the program. I don't think the program is necessary nor is residential parking be something the city should be involved with. I shouldn't be taxed to park in a spot I already pay property taxes and excise tax for. Everyone knew the parking situation/limitations when they chose to move into the neighborhood. They need to be adults and live with their choice.
The program is a net negative on my household in that there are limited benefits with significant inconveniences for limited guest passes

My tenants have 4 cars, the guest pass is used as a regular permit. It could be one permit per registered CAR per unit to said address. Tenants who do not have their cars registered to said unit must show a lease with their name on it to said address. Businesses should stay at 3, per zoning they are supposed to have off-street parking.

1) As individuals that rent, we are here temporarily because of school, internships, etc. The requirement to have multiple pieces of proof of residency is not easy to come by. I live in a house with 6 of us. All of our cars are registered to our family's home addresses and we are attached to family cell phone bills. The heat and electricity and water stay in my name. To get my roommmates a parking pass was almost an impossible challenge due to not having an additional piece of mail here. If a renter signs a lease and shows proof of that lease and their ID, that should suffice to receive a pass.
As individuals that work in Portsmouth and live here, we shouldn't be a target to be ticketed.

2) We have resident passes. There is no reason a car should have to be moved every 72 hours because it is a town law. If we are in this NPP bubble, then we should be allowed to stay as many days as we want without moving our car. That pass should negate any parking bylaw for 72 hour street program. Realistically think about it like this: I live here. I have a pass. But I have to move my car every 3 days to avoid a $50 ticket and potential tow. That is targeting your own residents! The point of this program is to help residents, not look for ways to ticket them.

3) If this program is to move forward, passes need to have expiration dates on them. When we first moved here, we werent allowed passes because the previous tenants left. From day 1, we had to fight just to park in our own neighborhood! Having passes that need to get renewed can eliminate a lot of headache

4) Have an online registration program for visitors if an individual is having a party/get-together. It is rare to have bigger events, but it would make it easier.
5) Allow houses to have 2 visitors passes. There is no shortage of street parking here. An extra visitors pass would be beneficial. Living in a house with 6 of us, it is very difficult when our girlfriend's want to stay the day/night. It becomes a project

It is not appropriate to use $100,000 per year to reserve prime parking spaces for a few neighbors who want exclusive rights to the parking in front of their house. The parking belongs to all city residents.

I wish all those in the program will realize how it's had a profound positive effect on our streets.

My wife and I own a condo on Islington St but have Barrington NH driver's license addresses. My wife applied for a resident permit. The attendant in the office was not certain whether my wife qualified and checked with her supervisor. The supervisor said my wife did qualify and the resident permit was issued. A week later when I applied, a different attendant was present and she did not want to issue me a permit. I explained what had occurred when my wife applied. The attendant checked with the attendant who had issued a permit to my wife and that attendant confirmed checking with the supervisor. At that point my attendant said she would reluctantly issue me the temporary permit but warned me not to expect to receive a standard permit once the trial period was over. And she made no attempt to be courteous about this. She was downright rude!

The rule explicitly allows a tenant with a non-Portsmouth driver's license, someone who does not pay property taxes to Portsmouth, to receive a permit. Yet I, who own a condo in the "resident" area, and pay lots of tax dollars to Portsmouth (LOTS!), am threatened by an office attendant with not being allowed to purchase a resident permit because my driver's license has a Barrington address. (I have had that address for 19 years and continue to own a house there. We have owned the Portsmouth condo for 8 years).

My point is simply this. I own a condo in the resident area and spend a good part of the year there. Resident property owners with proof of ownership (tax bills) and occupancy (utility bills) but without a Portsmouth driver's license should be allowed to purchase a resident permit and that should be made clear to the attendants at the parking office!

While there is a need for additional parking permits for our staff, the ones with permits continue to get parking tickets even when displaying a valid permit.

Street parking should be open to all taxpaying residents. People purchase property in dense neighborhoods knowing the parking limitations. Other taxpayers shoul not be denied parking on city owned streets.

If neighborhood parking programs are allowed, there should be a reduced fee to park downtown for residents who do not live downtown, subsidized by neighborhood parking programs.

We have a garage so really don't need the permits for our cars. We have 3 children and would have preferred more guest passes as an option rather than two permits and one guest.
I was able to get a permit as a property owner but it was difficult since the rules were written to require a drivers license with that address. I own two properties and my license is in the other address though I spend half time in Portsmouth. If a renter can get a permit, certainly a property owner who pays full taxes in Portsmouth should be able to get one. Please make this clear in the rules.

Not sure why the portion of Islington street adjacent to mobile station
(near Brewster) was excluded. I am handicapped and this is the nearest spaces to my residence.
No need for it at the West end of McDonough St because there was always adequate parking. So itâ€™s just a pain that visitors have to move their cars every 2 hours. Plus people getting ticketed for their cars hanging over their driveways is annoying since it isnâ€™t enforced in most residential areas in Portsmouth. Pain to get the passes, would be really annoying to pay for a pass.
Could be rule that daytime hours while residents are at work there in non residential parking but night time hours after work it becomes resident only parking

If you are a resident, ANY vehicle registered to your address should have a sticker.

We have 4 drivers and 4 cars in our house not enought passes and have company.
I got a ticket for parking on a day I forgot to put the pass in the window and the city guy knows its my car. Never gave a warning âš ï¸ . The pass was on my passenger seat just not in the window.

It is not needed this far out on street. Mostly residents were ticketed from everything i had seen. More wasteful to have to pay for people to monitor parking. Just an annoyance as a program.

The data has consistently shown that it is not needed and it places an undo burden on some residents.

Businesses should not be allowed parking permits for employees or owners, unless they live there. They should be parking in their parking lots, leaving on street parking for their customers to do business within the two hour parking window. If they donâ€™t have a parking lot, then they can park in the city parking garages with a monthly pass, this way there can be a steady turn over of on street parking around businesses, which makes it fair for all of them. There are numerous cars parked on street all day, taking parking from either local residents (not everyone has a driveway) or customers looking to park close enough to a business for a quick visit in without having to walk a decent distance.

The registration process felt overly complex with a lot of unnecessary qualifications and extraneous paperwork.

There isn't a need. We are solving a problem we don't have. There are up to 50 spots available on any given day on McDonough. We should not be spending resident tax dollars to pay for a problem that doesnâ€™t exist. In addition, we are indirectly taxing contractors and visitors without a need.
It had lots of management at first, but diminished quite a bit.

Because of my physical address, my roommate and i were not properly allowed to participate in the program. i did get one pass for the entire apartment. the whole thing was wildly inconvenient, it allowed for no guest passes, and in no way any assurance of parking.

I don't see a difference in my part of the neighbor other than itâ€™s really annoying for my guests. I havenâ€™t gotten a permit yet because I work during the hours allotted for getting a permit. I also have a driveway so itâ€™s not a big deal most days. Itâ€™s just incredible frustrating when I have guests.

The parking should be available to all city residents ONLY with resident stickers (like every other town on the seacoast) with extra permits for neighborhood residents. Out of town/state vehicles should not be parking in resident zone/s unless they receive a permit from a resident for short term parking. This would make enforcing 100% easier than the current system.

Residents with no cars weren't eligible, meaning guests have had to park minutes away for months to avoid parking violations. There are several I know in this category. They should have the option of one guest with proof of residency. I work in town a few days and have had to park minutes away because my partner chooses to not have a car in a walkable city (a decision that is both cost and environment friendly).

It hasn't increased the available spaces.

There should not be passes available for residents outside the neighborhood.

Those with driveways should not have up to three passes.

There should not even be up to three passes plus a guest. This likely explains why parking is still such an issue. One plus a guest should be enough, especially as garages are still another option.

There are still times when I cannot find a parking space. This happens 3/7 days of the week at least and I expect that to rise in the summer busy months.

We can't have guests over for more than 2hours

It's been better with program.
People with out of state plates regularly park on the street, sometimes no parking. Hardly any tickets ever given out.

There shouldn't be a 72 hour parking limit if you reside in the neighborhood its our home and we shouldn't have to move our car every three days especially since most of us work downtown. A lease should be enough for a permit we shouldn't need more then one documentation especially since we are here temporarily for school so our licenses are out of state. All of our bills are in one persons name so a lot of us don't have a second piece of paper saying we live here when we have a lease that says we do

I should be able to get a pass with my lease. I am here temporarily on a lease because I go to school. The bills are in my roommates name and I pay him for monthly utilities. If I signed a lease and live in the neighborhood for the duration of the lease then that should suffice

Additionally I received a ticket for parking in my own neighborhood with a npp pass because I was here for 3 days. If I live here, I shouldnâ€™t have to move my car with a pass. I understand portsmouth has a street parking rule, but that should be negated with a program like this.
As a resident with a sticker, I should not be targeted. This program was to keep visitors from parking in our neighborhoods. It deters people like myself from wanting to rent here and work here in the future.

72 hour parking. As a resident, I shouldnâ€™t be targeted for parking in front of, or near my residence.

Also I am a student here on a short term lease and my residence has more than 3 people living in it. It was very difficult to acquire passes for the entire house.

I would not be willing to pay for this pass considering I am leaving shortly, and I believe I should have a pass for my neighborhood regardless.

The taxes my landlord pays on the property should be enough for a sticker on my truck, and the parking enforcement in this city collects enough money from all over town to fund the checking of stickers.
6 people live in this house so we needed more permits. Also living here I shouldnâ€™t have needed to move my car after 72 hours.

One of the neighbors parked a unregistered car on the street with a permit .

As a *Neighborhood* initiative, the allowance of non-neighborhood-residents to obtain permits, and for residents with off-street-parking (driveways, garages, etc.) is an appalling oversight to what should have been the primary focus of the initiative/program.

The communication regarding the program status has been middling at best, and neglected at worst; the only updates provided to residents was via (to the best of my knowledge) 1) an initial paper pamphlet, 2) the sudden appearance of the regulatory street signs, 3) another paper pamphlet also easily ruined by this time of year's rain and snow. The NPP site page hasn't been updated since December 21, 2021, and communication with people who live in the Islington Creek Neighborhood has been severely lacking.

Furthermore, the over $30,000 that has been sunk into "enforcing" the ban seems to have been an absolute waste with no benefit; I have seen cars parked for multiple days on the curb where there is no spot, cars without stickers or guest passes (and with out-of-town plates) unmoved for days. The only actual enforcement I have seen was during snow bans. And even WITH people doing all that, there has been no shortage of open spots compared to before the NPP plan went into place.