

Stancombe Place Feedback Deadline March 11, 2016

	Address	Name	Info received by: Call, Email, Mail	DateReceived	Option 1: No Parking in or within 10m of the cul-de- sac between 7am and 4pm Monday to Friday	Option 2: No Parking in or within 10m of the cul- de-sac at any time	Option 3: Removal of the center island and the furniture within it with no parking restrictions implemented	Additional Comments
	712 Stancombe Pl	Paul and Rhonda Glowasky	Email	26-02-2016	In Favour of Option 1			Please consider having "Residential Only" parking signs installed on both side of our street. With the change in the parking, which I completely agree with as we have seen the challenges associated with the turn around at the end of the cul-de-sac, we need to ensure that our street is not being used for day parking for those people parking here and then walking to work or taking out their bikes and riding down the EN rail trail. All of this we witness on a daily basis. Last week we watched 2 cars come every day at 630am, park and the two drivers got out and walked together down the street and out the trail entrance obviously walking to work at the Dockyard. On Friday I put a residential only note on their window and asked them not to return and this morning they did not return. However this should not be our responsibility to "police" this but in the past when we have approached people who have done the same thing their response has been a cheeky or belligerent "well it doesn't say residential parking now, does it?" If we are going to ease the congestion and provide a safe travel way for the large vehicles, which should be for more than just the garbage trucks as the fire trucks, ambulances, moving trucks, transit etc all have to maneuver that turn around area and applies to more than just stand business hours of 7am to 4pm quite frankly, then we need to ensure that non-residential vehicles are not parked here on the street and that we can just call to have them removed or ticketed if there are signs posted. Otherwise the removal of the parking around the traffic circle will create another parking issue as long as non-residential vehicles continue to use Stancombe Place as a park and ride street.
1	728 Stancombe Pl	Alan White	Email			In Favour of Option 2		
2		Nova Williams	Email	26-02-2016	In Favour of Option 1			Due to costs associated with Option 3
3		Josh Albus	Email	27-02-2016	In Favour of Option 1			I also think if you are going to do this you should make the street residential parking only to stop the dock yard people from parking on the street so that people with trailers and boats can get them out of the driveway.
4	707 Stancombe Pl	Patrick Thrasher	Email	27-02-2016		In Favour of Option 2		I choose option # 2 because emergency vehicles need access 24 hours a day.
5	718 Stancombe Pl	Lesley Quin	Email	29-02-2016	In Favour of Option 1			Thanks for your letter again regarding the turning circle on Stancombe Place. I going to have to vote for restricting parking between 7am and 4pm. This could cause more crowding further up Stancombe as those who normally park on the turn around move further up the street it seems to be the only option that makes sense.  I do however believe that adding a "residence parking only" sign would help. Might it be possible to find out how far up from the turning circle that parking restriction might go? For example – as far up as 720 Stancombe or the like?  Thanks again for your work on this issue.
6	720 Stancombe Pl	Jason Page	Email	01-03-2016				There is nothing wrong with cul-du-sac on Stancombe Place. Please just leave it as it is, and if that is not an option, then there needs to be a fourth option of a COMPITANT DRIVER!
7	701 Stancombe Pl	Brooke Nowak	Email	03-03-2016	In Favour of Option 1			
8	703 Stancombe Pl	Sophia Meglic	Email	03-03-2016			In Favour of Option 3	
9	721 Stancombe Pl	Geof Squarok	Email	07-03-2016	In Favour of Option 1			It would seem option #1 would be the most viable. Several of the homes are owned by one company so option 3 could result in rent increases that would make this neighborhood unaffordable.
10		Lou	Email	09-03-2016		In Favour of Option 2		
11								The results from previous survey seems to suggest that most of the people living in Stancombe Place prefer no parking restriction at all. Therefore, I would like to propose option (4) for consideration. That is to shrink the central island if the related costs can be absorbed into the Township's operating budget. I went there to have a close look during work hours last week. I only saw one vehicle parked there and then another pulled up and parked. Three elderly people got off the vehicle. After making a short conversation with me, they went to walk in the trail. Currently, there are three things in the central island, a BC hydro metal box, a light pole and a utility hole. I don't know exactly how much we can reduce the size of the island. However, it seems to me that the utility hole, at least a portion of it, could be left outside of the island after the reduction because its lid can be switched to a metal or a cement one if necessary. Thank you for your work for the community.
12	705 Stancombe Pl	Jia Zhang	Email	09-03-2016	In Favour of Option 1			
13	722 Stancombe Pl	Daren	Email 10-03-2016					This is what I am now saying. I have lived on this street for 19 yrs. and in all those years nothing has happened to the circle until about the last year which brings me to think its time to retrain your drivers!! That would be by far the cheapest or have a pickup truck come down the street then transfer to the bigger truck. I have seen many big trucks come down here and with a little bit of still they can get around it. so back to retraining your drivers.

7 - In favour of Option 1

3 - In favour of Option 2

1 - In favour of Option 3