

Area H Extension Residents Parking Scheme Report (June 2009)

In May 2009 an information leaflet and map, plus questionnaire about a proposed extension to the Area H Residents Parking Scheme was sent to 1766 households in an area to the east of the current Area H scheme surrounding the Royal Sussex County Hospital in Kemptown.

708 valid¹ questionnaires were received giving a response rate of 40%.

Q1 Which of the following best describes your feeling about the proposal to include your area into the existing Area H parking scheme?

	No. of respondents	% Respondents
I would strongly support it	201	28.4
I would support it to some extent	119	16.8
No opinion either way	31	4.4
I am against it to some extent	80	11.3
I am completely against it	277	39.1
Total	708	100

Breaking this down into whether people support or do not support the scheme numbers are:

- 320 (45.2%) In favour
- 357 (50.4%) Not in Favour
- A further 31 people (4.4%) expressed no opinion either way.

¹ Questionnaires from respondents outside the area and those where the main question (1) was not answered were removed.

Item 40 Appendix B

On a road by road basis:

Road name (no addresses mailed in each road)	I would strongly support it		I would support it to some extent		No opinion either way		I am against it to some extent		I am completely against it		Response rate for road	Overall in favour ²
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No. (%)	%
Ansty Close (15)	1	14.3	2	28.6	0	0	2	28.6	2	28.6	7 (47)	42.9
Arundel Place (64)	8	32	6	24	1	4	5	20	5	20	25 (39)	56
Arundel Road (89)	7	28	4	16	0	0	3	12	11	44	25 (28)	44
Arundel Street (109)	9	29	8	25.8	3	9.7	2	6.5	9	29	31 (28)	54.8
Bennett Road (74)	27	52.9	5	9.8	1	2	2	3.9	16	31.4	51 (69)	62.7
Bristol Gardens (74)	4	28.6	3	21.4	1	7.1	1	7.1	5	35.7	14 (19)	50
Bristol Place (16)	0	0	2	50	0	0	2	50	0	0	4 (25)	50
Bristol Street (20)	10	71.4	2	14.3	0	0	0	0	2	14.3	14 (70)	85.7
Cowfold Road (75)	6	15	8	20	2	5	5	12.5	19	47.5	40 (53)	35
De Courcel Road (17)	3	37.5	1	12.5	0	0	1	12.5	3	37.5	8 (47)	50
Eastern Place (12)	1	33.3	2	66.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	3 (25)	100
Eastern Road (58)	2	14.3	3	21.4	1	7.1	3	21.4	5	35.7	14 (24)	35.7
Flimwell Close (21)	2	50	1	25	0	0	0	0	1	25	4 (19)	75
Henley Road (48)	8	44.4	5	27.8	0	0	1	5.6	4	22.2	18 (37)	72.2
Manor Close (28)	2	22.2	0	0	2	22.2	2	22.2	3	33.3	9 (32)	22.2
Manor Crescent (20)	2	25	3	37.5	1	12.5	0	0	2	25	8 (40)	62.5
Manor Gardens (45)	2	13.3	6	40	3	20	1	6.7	3	20	15 (33)	53.3
Manor Green (13)	2	28.6	1	14.3	1	14.3	1	14.3	2	28.6	7 (53)	42.9
Manor Hill (88)	5	13.9	6	16.7	2	5.6	6	16.7	17	47.2	36 (41)	30.6
Manor Paddock (27)	3	75	0	0	0	0	1	25	0	0	4 (15)	75
Manor Place (5)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	100	4 (80)	0

² Red = road not in favour overall, green = road in favour general, yellow = neutral

Item 40 Appendix B

Road name (no addresses mailed in each road)	I would strongly support it		I would support it to some extent		No opinion either way		I am against it to some extent		I am completely against it		Response rate for road	Overall in favour ³
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No. (%)	%
Manor Road (42)	2	11.8	3	17.6	1	5.9	2	11.8	9	52.9	17 (40)	29.4
Manor Way (76)	5	13.9	8	22.2	0	0	7	19.4	16	44.4	36 (47)	36.1
Maresfield Road (119)	30	53.6	8	14.3	1	1.8	3	5.4	14	25	56 (47)	67.9
Marlow Road (20)	2	15.4	1	7.7	1	7.7	2	15.4	7	53.8	13 (65)	9.1
Peel Road (33)	3	14.3	1	4.8	2	9.5	2	9.5	13	61.9	21 (64)	19.1
Playden Close (16)	0	0	1	33.3	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3	3 (19)	33.3
Prince Regent's Cl (64)	9	26.5	9	26.5	0	0	7	20.6	9	26.5	34 (53)	53
Prince's Terrace (76)	18	54.5	4	12.1	0	0	0	0	11	33.3	33 (43)	66.6
Reading Road (39)	4	20	1	5	1	5	2	10	12	60	20 (51)	25
Robin Dene (12)	1	33.3	0	0	0	0	1	33.3	1	33.3	3 (25)	33.3
Roedean Road (44)	2	22.2	2	22.2	0	0	2	22.2	3	33.3	9 (20)	44.4
Rugby Place (132)	9	20	2	4.4	3	6.7	6	13.3	25	55.6	45 (34)	24.4
Whitehawk Road (153)	9	15	10	16.7	4	6.7	5	8.3	32	53.3	60 (39)	31.7
Wilson Avenue (22)	2	12.5	1	6.3	0	0	2	12.5	11	68.8	16 (73)	18.8
Totals (1766)	201	28.4	119	16.8	31	4.4	80	11.3	277	39.1	708 (40)	45.2

³ Red = road not in favour overall, green = road in favour general, yellow = neutral

Q2 People were asked whether they are a resident, manage a business in the area, visitor to the area or work in the area (tick as many as apply)

	No. of responses	% responses
Resident	703	93.0
Own or manage a business in the area	21	2.8
Visitor to the area	1	0.1
Work in the area	31	4.1
Total responses	756	100

Q3 What type of business do you own or manage in the area?

Type of business	No. of responses
Retail-outlet	6
Office-based	11
Other business	25
Total responses	42

Other types of business listed are:

- BHCC housing office
- Birthing pool hire
- Bookmakers
- Building company
- Car, garage, workshop
- Caretaker resident
- Charity, training and employment
- Childminder
- Dental surgery
- Fish and chip shop
- Gardener
- Hair salon
- Health spa
- Holiday property let
- Joinery manufacturing
- Landlord
- Launderette
- Light industrial unit
- Massage therapy
- Musician
- Pottery artisan
- School
- Take away
- Taxi proprietor
- Woodwork joinery manufacture

Q4 How many vehicles are directly associated with your business?

These figures have been cross-tabbed with the 21 people who said in Question 2 that they own or manage a business in the area (5 of these did not state the number of vehicles associated with their business).

	Number of vehicles	%
1	7	41
2	2	12
3	2	12
4 or more	6	35
Total respondents	16	100

Q5 How will the scheme affect business performance?

These figures have been cross-tabbed with the 21 people who said in Question 2 that they own or manage a business in the area (5 of these did not state how business might be affected).

	Number	%
Very helpful to my business	1	6.2
Helpful to my business	1	6.2
No opinion either way	3	19
Restrict my business	2	12.4
Very restrictive to my business	9	56.2
Total responses	16	100

Q6 How many cars in your household?

692 people answered this question.

	No. of cars	%
0	140	20
1	333	48
2	161	23.5
3	55	8
4 or more	3	0.5
Total responses	692	100

Q7 Do you have access to off-street car parking?

668 people answered this question.

	Number	%
Yes	236	35
No	432	65
Total responses	668	100

Q8 If a scheme were to be implemented, in order to reduce the amount of signs and posts on-street, would you be prepared to allow the council to affix parking signage to your wall/ property?

A list of contact details for those who said yes can be forwarded to the relevant traffic engineer but is not included here for the purposes of data protection.

Q9 Open comments box asking people to write any other comments about the proposed scheme.

708 respondents made 625 comments. These comments were coded into a number of commonly occurring themes and can be grouped as follows:

Comment	No. of responses	% of responses
I don't want to pay for parking	154	25
This is purely a money making exercise by the council	77	12
Concerns about hospital displacement parking	58	9
There is no need for a parking scheme	48	8
Concerns about the cost of visitor parking	39	6
Driving is dangerous in the area due to hazardous parking	31	5
Concerns that the scheme will not leave enough space for emergency vehicles to get through	30	5
In favour because of current parking difficulties	26	4
Not enough residents parking spaces in the scheme	23	4
Concerns about disabled parking	21	3
General negative comments	17	3
Not enough visitor permits	17	3
I am worried about displacement parking	15	2
General positive comments	14	2
Want grass verges taken away for extra parking space	11	2
Concerns that the scheme will adversely affect businesses in the area	8	1
This will reduce long term parking in the area	8	1
I am unhappy about the hours of scheme operation	6	1
Don't want 11 hours pay & display as this enables workers to park all day	5	1
Complaint about mail out error	4	0.5
Want a light touch scheme (eg two hours a day)	3	0.5
Feel disadvantaged as we have off-street parking	3	0.5
Need business parking bays	3	0.5
More loading bays needed	2	
Need parking permits for carer	2	
Total comments	625	100

There were 7 further one-off comments as follows:

- All residents of manor close are elderly or disabled please leave as is.
- Can we have discount in first year as other schemes have
- Communal bins
- Don't want double yellow lines across driveways
- Don't want any pay & display
- Scheme won't solve night time parking problem
- Would like cycle rack like those in Brunswick Square

There were other comments irrelevant to current scheme proposal but a general theme is unused disabled bays should be reviewed.

Demographic Information

Gender	No.	%
Male	294	41.5
Female	309	43.6
No reply	105	14.8
Total	708	100

Age range	No.	%
18-24	10	1.4
25-34	58	8.2
35-44	125	17.7
45-54	129	18.2
55-64	116	16.4
65-74	90	12.7
75+	74	10.5
No reply	106	15.0
Total	708	100

Disability	No.	%
Yes	155	21.9
No	418	59.0
No reply	135	19.1
Total	708	100

Ethnicity	No.	%
White British	527	74.7
White Irish	10	1.4
Other white background	28	4.0
Indian	5	0.7
Bangladeshi	1	0.1
Other Asian background	6	0.8
White and Black Caribbean	1	0.1
White and Black African	1	0.1
White and Asian	1	0.1
Caribbean	1	0.1
Chinese	2	0.3
Other ethnic background	3	0.4
Don't know	1	0.1
No reply	121	17.1
Total	708	100

