

Appendix B - Preston Park Station North Residents Parking Scheme (Ext to Area A) - Consultation Report October 2013

Background

In 2009 the Area A Residents Parking Scheme was introduced and in 2011 residents in Tivoli Crescent were consulted and subsequently included in the scheme.

Since then, the unrestricted roads to the north of Preston Park Station have experienced parking pressures and the council has received requests to look at this area to see whether support for a residents parking scheme has changed.

In September 2013 a leaflet and questionnaire giving details about proposals for a resident parking scheme was sent to all property addresses in the unrestricted roads within an area to the north of Preston Park Station.

Headline Findings

The consultation achieved a 57% response rate.

50% of respondents were in favour of an extension to the Residents Parking Scheme and 50% of respondents were against the extension of the scheme.

Methodology

Brighton and Hove City Council Land and Property Gazetteer was used to provide 318 property addresses in an unrestricted parking area to the north of Preston Park Station in Brighton. An information leaflet, detailed maps, a questionnaire and a prepaid envelope for reply was sent to each address. Respondents were invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal should they wish to: 24 respondents (13%) chose this method.

Plans could also be viewed at exhibitions staffed by officers from Brighton & Hove City Council at:

Church of the Good Shepherd (Dyke Road):

1pm to 5pm, Tuesday 17 September
4pm to 8pm, Wednesday 18 September

There was also an unstaffed exhibition at Hove Town Hall, Norton Road from Monday 2 September, 2012 to Friday 11 October, 2012, 9am to 5pm.

182 responses¹ were received giving a response rate of 57%.

¹ The following responses were not included: 9 from outside the area, 1 where no street name was given, 1 corner property not included in the scheme boundary but would be

Results

Q1 Are you in favour of a residents parking scheme extension into your road?

Yes		No		Total
Number	%	Number.	%	
91	50	91	50	182

Results on a street by street basis were as follows:

Street	No. properties mailed	No. responses	Response rate %	Yes		No	
				No.	%	No.	%
Dyke Road	49	21	41	13	62	8	38
Maldon Road	115	68	59	23	34	45	66
Matlock Road	59	35	59	25	71.5	10	28.5
Tivoli Crescent North	46	28	61	16	57	12	43
Tivoli Road	49	30	61	14	47	16	53
Total	318	182		91	50	91	50

In addition, 7 corner properties were included in the consultation mailing. These properties will not be included within the proposed scheme boundary but would be eligible for a permit. Only one response was received from a corner property on Withdean Road and this person was in favour of the scheme.

Q2 Respondents were asked whether they are a resident, a business owner or manager or work in the area. Respondents could tick more than one option.

	Number of responses	% respondents
Resident	175	96
Business owner or manager	11	6
Work in the area	6	3

Q3a How many cars in your household?

No. of cars	No. responses	Total No cars	% respondents
0	6	0	3
1	101	101	57
2	59	118	33
3	11	33	6
Total	177	253	100

eligible for a permit if the scheme is introduced and 10 duplicates (only one response was included from each household).

177 respondents have 253 vehicles (= 1.4 vehicles per household).

Q3b Do you have access to off-street car parking?

Yes		No		Total
No.	%	No.	%	
59	33	119	67	178

Q4a What type of business do you own or manage in the area?

What type of business?	No. responses
Retail outlet	3
Office-based	1
Other, includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Carer visits • Chiropody/ podiatry practice • Consultancy • GP practice x 2 • Holiday let • Home based • Medical: cancer clinic • Restaurant • Taxi 	10
Total responses	14

Q4b How many vehicles are directly associated with your business?

No. of vehicles	No. responses	Total No. vehicles
1	7	7
2	1	2
3	2	6
4 or more	3	12
Total	13	27

13 respondents had at least 27 vehicles associated with their business (= 2.1 vehicles per business).

Q5 Any other comments?

An open text box enabled respondents to add comments. Although expressed in residents' own words analysis of the open text shows common themes emerged and have been grouped as followed below. The figures show the amount of times a comment was made which is in some cases from the same household.

Comments	No. of times made
Parking problems caused by commuters particularly during the week / no parking problems at weekends.	33
General positive comments	29
No need for a scheme	25
General negative comments	20
Concerns about visitor parking (cost, amount of permits, restricts visitors for elderly / at weekends)	19
Don't want to pay to park / it is too expensive	15
Concerns about displacement	13
Not enough residents parking spaces in the scheme	10
Unhappy about hours of operation	7
Don't want more double yellow lines or double yellow lines across driveways	7
Needs enforcement of current illegal parking	6
Want a light touch scheme	5
This is a money-making exercise	4
Want more Double Yellow Lines	2
Concerns that the scheme will adversely affect businesses in the area	2
Concerns about disabled parking	2
Want shorter hours for Pay & Display	2
Needs more motor cycle bays	1
Needs enforcement of current illegal parking	1
Need more cycle parking in the area	1
More loading bays needed	1
Concerns that there will not be enough room for emergency vehicle access	1

Demographic Information

Gender

Gender	Number	%
Male	82	58.7
Female	62	42.3
Total	144	100

Do you identify as the gender you were assigned at birth?	Number	%
Yes		
No		
Total		100

Age

Age	Number	%
18-24	1	0.8
25-34	4	3.4
35-44	36	30.5
45-54	41	34.7
55-64	19	16.1
65-74	7	5.9
75+	10	8.4
Total	118	100

Disability

Disability	Number	%
Yes	16	12.5
No	112	87.5
Total	128	100

Of those who answered “yes”, disabilities were as follows:

Please state the type of impairment which applies to you.	Number	% ²
Physical impairment	12	47
Sensory impairment	0	0
Learning disability/ difficulty	0	0
Long-standing illness	8	38
Mental health condition	1	5
Development condition	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	21	100

² % of those who answered yes to the disability question above

Ethnicity

Ethnicity		Number	%
White	White English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	125	88.7
	White Irish	0	0
	Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0	0
	Any other white background	9	6.4
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	0	0
	Indian	2	1.4
	Pakistani	0	0
	Chinese	1	0.7
	Any other Asian background	0	0
Black or Black British	African	0	0
	Caribbean	1	0.7
	Any other Black background	0	0
Mixed	Asian & White	2	1.4
	Black African & White	0	0
	Black Caribbean & White	0	0
	Any other mixed background	0	0
Any other ethnic group	Arab	0	0
	Any other ethnic group	1	0.7
Total		141	100