

Appendix D

Proposed extension of Area J Preston Park Triangle area - summary of representations

Proposed extension of Area J Preston Park Triangle area - summary of representations		
Who	Supports Summary	Referenced paragraph in main report
(1) resident in area	We are still experiencing daily obstruction of both the road and pavements by cars parked on this single track road - despite there being street parking spaces available within a few yards. The police do not feel able to help. We would like to have your assurance that this road will be seen as in need of parking restrictions (double yellow lines) regardless of whether or not the TRO is approved. Please let me know if we should make a formal application for this.	4.7
(2) resident in area	I fully support the scheme as detailed. It is essential in alleviating the very difficult current parking situation in the Preston Park Triangle area. I believe the scheme proposed offers the best solution for residents and businesses and for improving access for visitors to the Fiveways shops, an important local amenity. The inclusion of Preston Drove in the scheme is vital.	4.7
(3) resident in area	I believe this initiative will improve a most difficult parking situation for the Five Ways area. There have been occasions when I have been unable to park and have had to park many streets away with not only unnecessary time spent doing this but an increase of fuel use with resultant adverse environmental issues.	4.7
(5) resident in area	There are too many cars being parked in this area with chaotic results such as frequent double parking, pavement parking, parking on corners and adjacent to dropped kerbs intended for the use of pedestrians, adults with buggies, wheelchairs and disabled people. The bumper to bumper cars are a hindrance to those on bike or foot and prevent full visibility at junctions. On-street cycle parking would be useful. I strongly support this TRO as a resident of Havelock Road.	4.7
(6) resident in area	I support this TRO because it will bring order to car parking which is currently chaotic. I also support the proposal to instate Pedal Cycle Parking Places At Any Time: in Havelock Road, Cleveland Road and Southdown Road.	4.7
(7) resident in area	As a local resident I'd like to record my support for the following element of the Traffic Regulation Order proposal that goes to ETS Committee on 1st July: 'no waiting at any time' restrictions for Southdown Place (double yellow lines)	4.7
Who	Objects Summary	Referenced paragraph in main report
(1) resident (outside area)	Reasons: 1. This proposal will intensify pressure on nearby areas that are not within a parking zone. 2. Given that most homes do not have garages, there is no option for residents but to pay. 3. The proposed charge is excessive; it is far more than the cost of administering the scheme and must include a large element of additional taxation by the Council; in other parts of the country local parking schemes are operated for as little as £30 per annum per vehicle and commonly around £50 per annum.	4.16, 4.9,4.9
(2) resident outside area	I object to the extension of parking restrictions - i.e. making people pay for parking in these areas because - any parking problem is created by the council only to make money. The proposals claim to improve amenities, improve flow of traffic and to avoid danger ??? cut the nonsense and admit that its to make money. People would rather not pay for parking thanks very much - we pay road tax !! remember ? there was never ever any parking problems in this area until the council started putting paid restrictions in place - and then make the streets adjacent more packed with cars to avoid paying. even on sundays until 8 pm, is worse than a lot of London. its only to make money so admit it - its a form of extortion. if you want to make an area more safe with access to amenities then do it with out extorting money from residents that have chosen to live here because of the absence of paid parking.	4.9, 4.18, 4.23
(3) resident outside area	I live in **** and it is already almost impossible to park in my street. Does the council really believe that everyone in Preston drove and other roads with the new restrictions, will pay to park ? No, what they will do is park in roads like **** in order to avoid paying and will mean that we won't be able to park in our own street ! I have no problem paying for spaces to park in *** so why doesn't the council extend the scheme ? Every day there are lorries, vans, and travellers vehicles parked in Preston drove. Where will these move to ? virtually everyone I know in the street is against the proposal BUT would accept the proposal being extended to ****. We had a cafe open in **** last year and that alone has meant massive parking restrictions as their clients take up what little space is available to park. please re consider the scheme.	4.16
(4) resident outside area	With regard to the above proposal, I have absolutely no objection to the purpose and objectives of the suggested parking zone extension, it seems to me eminently sensible and addresses a real problem. BUT as a resident of ***** I am horrified because it is absolutely inevitable that the problem you are addressing here will immediately transfer to Lowther Road, Osborne Road, Hyde Road, Ashford Road, Dover Road and Balfour Road at the very minimum. Please could you tell me a) why you are not introducing this across the whole of Fiveways in order to mitigate this instantly b) what measures you have in place to counter the parking hell which is about to descend on these areas now just outside a designated parking zone? Given that evenings are already completely blocked and there is much dangerous parking across corners you will undoubtedly create the exact scenarios north of the parking extension which you have identified as the reason for the extension in the first place.	4.16

(5) resident outside area	I object to these proposals on the following grounds :-1. They will have the effect of moving the displaced vehicles into the next arenorth of Preston Drive. As this was pointed out when area J was first proposed then I can only assume that this is what your intention is. I ust further assume that those of us living in the area of Fiveways and Hollindean are next on your list. 2. These proposals will undoubtedly have a knock-on influence on the shops at Fiveways. Once you have further extended these restrictions, as I'm sure is your intention, then it will badly affect their trade. Why pay £1 to stop for 20 mins at Fiveways when the carpark at Asda is free? 3. The reasons given are weak. At least for the original area J you made the pretence of a case i.e parking around London Road station.I regret to say that, in my opinion, these proposals are just another way of increasing our Council Tax by making the motorist pay. You have always stated that your aim is to get more people to use the bus, so it is somewhat ironic that the day I saw the notices on the lampposts of Preston Drive, I also saw that the bus fares are going up again.	4.16, 4.17
(6) resident outside area	The proposed Controlled Parking Zone will cause major overspill for roads north of Preston Drive. I would therefore like to ask the council to monitor the overspill situation north of Preston Drive as a matter of urgency. Residential roads north of Preston Drive are already experiencing considerable pressure in terms of the parking situation. The Controlled Parking Zone needs to be extended to include residential roads north of Preston Drive.	4.16
(7) resident outside area	I am writing to you about the proposed "Preston Triangle" parking scheme. When I completed the questionnaire, I was of the understanding that I was voting for or against the scheme as defined in the documentation. There was no mention that the results would be looked at on a road by road bases. I votes against the scheme. I now understand that it has been proposed that the lower half of Preston Drive is not to be in the scheme. This was not on "Option" in the questionnaire and I certainly would not have voted for it. I now find myself in the worst of all possible situations being just outside the scheme. I would not qualify for a permit and all people not wishing to pay will park outside my house. I was not consulted on the proposed "Half of Preston Drive" solution. I accept that most people have voted for the scheme and so would propose that either a) The full Preston Triangle scheme as originally outlined is implemented (i.e. including all of Preston Drive), or b) The "Residential Side of the lower part of Preston Drive is made "Permit Holders Only"	4.26, 4.16
(8) resident outside area	I live in **** which is one of the side streets off Surrenden Road and 2 roads away from the area of the proposed restrictions. While I do not own a car myself, there is one in our household. I have been continually concerned by the increase in parking restrictions from the centre of the city moving further out into the suburban areas. The effect that this has had has been to result in an increase in vehicles parking further out of the City. It does not solve any problem of parking but moves it to other areas that were previously less affected.I am therefore very concerned that this is an attempt to introduce more parking pressure in the area to the North of Preston Drive and timely make the case for parking restrictions in the adjoining areas. I am strongly opposed to this as a long-time resident of Brighton as it also affects the ability for visitors to the area to park. We have indeed seen an increase in commercial vehicle parking on Surrenden Road and the adjoining streets and I believe that these new parking restrictions will similarly increase such pressure. In terms of the maximum level of metered and permitted areas I am strongly of the opinion that the restriction time zones are excessive and these should be reduced from 10am - 4pm (both residents permit and metered parking) and not apply at weekends given that this would allow local residents the opportunity to gain parking during off-peak hours while restricting some of the commercial vehicle traffic. In addition the areas should be permitted 24hours for commercial vehicles as we have seen an increase in out of hours parking (effectively storage) of commercial vehicles. I look forward to you consideration of this amendment. Furthermore I would request that you consider dropping this proposal in its entirety.	4.16
(9) resident outside area	I am writing in regard to the proposal for a controlled parking zone in the Preston Park triangle south of and in Preston Drive which is planned to be introduced in the summer.As has been seen in other areas of the city, this will almost certainly cause a major problem with overspill parking north of Preston Drive if those affected by the controlled parking zone fail to buy permits for all their vehicles.I would like to register my strong opposition to this taking place and request that, should this in fact take place, the roads north of Preston Drive be included in the scheme from the outset to prevent these problems from occurring.There is currently just about adequate parking for the residents in these areas and any increase in parking by residents of other areas will create a nightmare situation for residents.	4.16
(10) resident outside area	I am writing with regards to the planned extension to Zone J as I am a resident of *** Road which does not appear to be included in the new restrictions. The parking on ****Road is already very busy and I often have to park a fair distance away from my house; it is necessary for me to have a car as I am a **** so I therefore need a car to attend meetings and visit service users. I believe that if you only have the Zone J extension up to Preston drive you will repeat the problems which already exist on the roads lower down. I ask, what is being done to prevent this inevitable problem occurring? Is there a possibility to extend Zone J to include *****?	4.16
(11) resident outside area	The residents of *****, originally included in the scheme laid out in the consultation document but now omitted, will be adversely effected by your proposal. The other houses that are on the stretch of road being omitted all have off-street parking,We believe that the zone should be extended to *****. We also believe that the majority of residents ***** are now in favour of such an extension and that the interests of the residents should take precedence over the views of the local businesses and sports clubs.As the original consultation made no mention of the possibility that only part of the zone would be included, several of our immediate neighbours voted against the scheme. But they voted against the scheme in its entirety and all those that I have spoken to have now said that they would not have voted against the scheme if all of the possible options had been presented to them. We believe that by offering two options in the consultation process, and then selecting a third (previously unmentioned) option, the consultation process has been invalidated.We also received no response to our question as to whether residents of the houses that were included in the original consultation, but are now being omitted, would be able to purchase a permit for the zone. This would not be the ideal solution, but would at least provide us with some compensation for what looks like a disastrous decision for us.Can you please come back to us on this as a matter of urgency as we feel very strongly about this issue.	4.26
(12) resident outside area	I am a resident in *** Road, an area north of Preston Drive and the proposed parking zone in the Preston Park triangle.Whilst I appreciate the difficult parking issues that we face in this area on a day to day basis, I am very concerned about the knock on effect that the controlled parking zone is going to have on our road and roads north of Preston Drive.We are already in a position that we are not able to find a parking space after about 6pm and I foresee that this will be made even worse when controlled parking is introduced. All the commuter cars that currently park in the Preston park triangle will move to our roads and anyone who doesn't have a permit for their vehicle.I would like to request that the parking situation is monitored in roads north of Preston Drive following the introduction of controlled parking and that the council consult on the idea of a parking scheme in this area as well.	4.16
(13) resident outside area	: I'm writing to object to this Traffic Order: 1) unless and until the Council commits to carrying out 'before and after' surveys of on street parking in the area north of Preston Drive and 2) the Council commits to reviewing its Parking Strategy to include the area north of Preston Drive as one that will be consulted on for future Controlled Parking Zone. The reasons for the objections are that the extension of CPZ J is likely to cause displaced parking into areas north of Preston Drive. The Council's survey showed that there were 1.3 vehicles per respondent household. The assertion that people with vehicles were more likely to respond is not backed up with any evidence. Not all residents in the zone will buy permits for all their own or visitors' vehicles. This is particularly the case for households with more than one vehicle, including business vehicles (about 10% of respondents to the Council's survey had 1.9 vehicles per household. Business vehicle permits are more expensive than vehicles for private use so are more likely to be parked outside the area). It is undemocratic to ignore the views of people who live outside the proposed CPZ area. The Council report ignored the concerns of the 81 respondents to the survey who lived outside the area, despite the acknowledged problem of displacement. I trust that the views of all respondents will be reported and taken into account by the Council.	4.16

(14) resident outside area	: I'm writing to ask you to take steps not to spread the misery of displaced parking. Please consider the effect of displaced parking outside residents' parking zones. The streets in the northern section of the existing Zone J are well below capacity which has caused parking problems in the Triangle. Those of us who live just outside the Triangle to the north (I live in **** Road) are already seeing extra cars in our streets. This will only get worse after the new scheme is introduced as residents in the Triangle can't or won't pay for permits for their own or their business's vehicles or for visitors. The Council did not consult people living in the streets to the north of Preston Drove which will receive the displaced vehicles, I requested that we were consulted, why wasn't this done? Surely it is obvious that the already overcrowded streets north of Preston Drove will be adversely effected by the new scheme. I think this is undemocratic and shows that there is no "overall" plan for residents parking in Brighton or commitment to "consultation". Please do not approve this without first assessing the effect of the proposed extension to the surrounding streets.	4.16
(15) resident outside area	I live in ***Road on the edge of a proposed new parking zone. please can *** Road also be included in your monitoring of the area? as its obvious that any changes locally will have a huge impact on our road.	4.16
(16) resident outside area	We've noted a proposed scheme nearby, and obviously want to encourage a parking proposal that might alleviate problems and provide parking opportunities. Parking in ***Road currently, is far from easy and 40% of the time we have to park on another street, so we would request that the Council monitors the parking situation closely after the introduction of the above scheme and that we are consulted on a parking scheme in our roads.	
(17) resident outside area	I object to the new proposals for several reasons:1) There is nothing in the area to require such parking restrictions especially in the roads coming south from Preston Drove, there is no station, no offices, no factories and no shops, which equals NO PARKING EMS. 2) This is purely a money-making exercise and will cause problems where at the moment there aren't any.3) It will push cars north of Preston Drove causing parking congestion.4) Parking North of Preston Drove will be affected with the knock on effect of the council insisting on extending the residents parking area north of Fiveways.5) Not enough residents vouchers will be allowed so although people will be paying for the right to park it will not guarantee a space, again a money-making scheme. I could go on further but can't really see the point as in my experience you people at the council don't listen to the residents anyway. What I would like to know (and I would like a genuine reason) why is this parking scheme being considered? Residents in those roads don't want it, there are already charges to park around Preston Park so the council already gets revenue from that which must make a fair amount of money. The whole scheme is pointless and a waste of council tax payers money plus we pay another fee on top of our council tax! I would love to know a true breakdown of where all the parking revenue goes to in Brighton and Hove, it certainly does not benefit residents or motorists! also uest that overspill parking is monitored. Also to consult fully on a scheme for North of Preston Drove where the residents are really against such proposals.	4.23, 4.9, 4.16, 4.10, 4.20
(18) resident outside area	As a resident of *** Road, I am mailing to oppose the introduce of resident parking to the **** area; all this will do is use more parking problems within the area. Already there are many cars that double park over night, causing a danger during the morning commute; there are a number of cars that also mound the pavement. This will cause a massive problem if more cars are vying for the few spaces that we have. I also disagree with the principle of resident's parking, as this does not improve the amount of spaces to park; parking is not eased and permits become a money-making scheme with little benefits for residents. It does not solve the parking problems within Brighton and just pushes congestion into the next 'zone' that has no restrictions. We have already noticed this within ****from restrictions further down. Please stop the resident parking scheme and instead spend the money on improving the parking within the area (eg introduce herring bone systems).	4.9, 4.16
(19) resident outside area	I am concerned about the impact on parking in roads north of the scheme. Every time a new parking restriction is implemented in this area it just shifts those that park locally and are non-residents further out of the city into other roads and does not solve the problem itself.	4.16
(20) resident outside area	1. Cost of residents permits & the allocated visitor permits. (need for more flexibility here 2. Impact on local businesses & their trade. Is this being monitored independently ?3. Impact on elderly residents and visitors (particularly in relation to visitor permits) 4. Displaced parking - the impact on my road and others in the area. It will & does happen - we have seen it all over the city. When you travel routes daily you see a different picture to the odd monitoring research undertaken by people who comment that they can't see any. 5. What will happen to households with more than one car. In a city as expensive as ours many partners in a family have to work and take the work where they can. As a consequence both may need cars for work. Not all of have the choice of working close to where we live with accessible public transport.6. The parking zone must be looked at strategically with other local issues and developments. e.g You have encouraged both Vardean, Dorothy Stringer and Balfour School to expand their numbers. Land space for new classrooms has meant in some cases staff parking has been moved. As a consequence staff now park in the surrounding area. This has had an impact on local parking. I am sure there is a lot of good work going on but to be honest all we seem to hear about is cycle lanes. As someone who cycles at times I am all for improving safety & encouraging health & fitness. We need to also improve conditions for the many small businesses in the city who are being crippled by business rates. I would urge councillors to widen consultations and not just focus on limited areas	4.9, 4.17, 4.10, 4.21, 4.16, 4.20, 4.22
(21) Resident in area	I strongly object to paying to park in my own street. I strongly object to paying for my visitors to park in my street or for them to pay to park to visit me. I strongly object to the scheme where in other restricted areas residents are only allowed to purchase a limited number of visitor permits. I strongly object to yet more street furniture being erected to make pavement access more difficult for pedestrians, prams and disabled. I strongly object to the Council prioritising such a scheme when there are so many more pressing concerns for the people of Brighton and Hove such as repairing damaged roads. (I believe I take my life in my hands each morning avoiding pot holes while cycling).	4.9, 4.10, 4.11, 4.23
22 Resident in area	The proposed plans to introduce shared permit and short term pay and display parking bays on the north side of ****directly in front of our house coupled with the introduction of exclusive short term pay and display bays directly opposite our house on the south side of **** will result in a massive reduction in parking opportunities for us, our neighbours and visitors. It does not seem unreasonable having lived here for 20 years to wish to be able to park near our house particularly as we will now be expected to purchase a permit under these proposals to do this we will be expected to pay annually and on a daily basis. ***% of **** voted against the scheme this has hardly been a democratic process. There were also many less draconian alternatives suggested which have also been dismissed. Parking was not an issue until zone J was introduced where now there are streets devoid of parked cars 24 -7.	4.13, 4.9, 4.14, 4.18

23 Vets practice in area	<p>strongly against the proposed parking restrictions however we can appreciate what you are trying to achieve. The alterations we would suggest to the plans would be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 24 hr access directly outside the front of our unit (104-106) • Sections near local business' to be free parking for up to one hour • Cost reduction for business permits- 	NB A loading bay is proposed as part of an amendment traffic order, 4.9, 4.17
24 Resident in area	<p>I am object to the scheme for a number of reasons. We do have a parking problem in the area following the introduction of the parking scheme in the Stanford Road area. It is now extremely difficult to park in our streets, especially of an evening. I do not believe that a parking zone will address these problems. It is after 8pm at night that the real problems happen, once all residents are home. There is simply not enough parking space for every resident to park appropriately. Parking on street corners is often the only option. Should you visit the area at night you will notice every street corner occupied by a car. Or, you will see residents driving round and round looking for somewhere to park. Personally, my car has been vandalised on numerous occasions by a resident who keeps breaking windscreen wipers on cars which they consider should be parked on street corners. I have reported the matter to the police and they have records of other residents experiencing similar problems. I am concerned that once parking areas have been marked out and large areas of the streets covered in double yellow lines, our parking opportunities will be further restricted. It was the case that the area around Blaker's Park was used as overflow parking for people in our streets but now this is jammed pack. This parking problem occurred only after the introduction of the Stanford Avenue zone because many households in that area did not and have not bought permits and so use our streets to save themselves money. Is this right and fair? What are you doing about this? I believe that the impact of the introduction of a parking zone in our area will impact in a huge way on the already congested roads off Preston Drove. I am appalled that the scheme will be from Monday to Sunday. The Council have told me that they are trying to stop people who work in the City from parking for free on our streets. If this is the case, why should they make it parking for residents only on a Saturday and a Sunday as well, when presumably most working people are parked in their own streets. This means, that when we have visitors on a weekend they have to pay to visit their families and friends. Our family members are pensioners who often stay overnight. Your proposal means they either pay to park and move after 4 hours or we provide them with a parking voucher at £2.60 each. When we have a family gathering, not only will I be providing food and drink etc to entertain my guests, I will also need to pay for them to park. Is this fair? Further, the very successful Open House movement. Many people who visit the Open Houses in the area use their cars to cover the streets involved. Often those with mobility problems. (I know, I have used my car to facility people gaining access.) Your parking proposals will make this very difficult. Can you tell me what I will be paying for when I cannot park even though I am expected to pay £120 per year for the privilege of searching for a space? Can you confirm that the resident parking zone which you are so anxious to introduce throughout the City will enable me to park in my street? If you cannot, what recourse do we have once you have introduced this costly and unsightly scheme, to demand that it be taken away? Will you give us planning permission to turn our front gardens into parking areas or is it only you, the Council, who are allowed to impose parking proposals on us, the tax-paying residents. Should you tell me that the City has a parking problem which has to be tackled, I would agree but your proposals are at odds with all that makes Brighton a magnet for visitors. Not least, the bus fares have gone up again. I think the advert on the back of a bus I saw recently, £9 for a family to get to and from town, shows just how appalling your transport plans are. That is a huge amount of money for low income families and, despite how ridiculously expensive they are, more costly than my family going to town in the car. I remain in opposition to the proposal. I believe the schemes are the Council's opportunity to make yet more money out of motorists and fail to offer residents a proper say in how our communities are run. You have taken no notice of the numerous suggestions made by residents who oppose the plans. You sent out a badly designed questionnaire in haste and you are acting in haste to try to remedy a huge problem of your own making.</p>	4.9, 4.13, 4.14, 4.16, 4.19, 4.20,
25 Resident in area	<p>I have lived in**** for nearly 20 years and chose it particularly because there was no problem with the parking here, and no cost for parking. Over the years the council has introduced more and more CPZs which has meant that parking has gradually become more and more difficult as residents wishing to avoid the purchase of the the expensive permits and parking fees in their area, now park in my area. As a result, residents here have voted for a CPZ in the area. In principle I have no problem IF it addresses the issues and problems that the council have caused. What I object to is the cost of the permits, and in particular the hourly parking charges for any visitors. I believe that my Human Rights will be breached through the introduction of the prohibitive charges. In particular: Article 1 of Protocol 1 - Protection of Property "You have the right to enjoy the things you own. Public organisations cannot interfere with things you own or the way you use them." - The intended charges will not allow me to enjoy my property or vehicle(s). Article 14 - Stopping Discrimination - I believe that the charges have a disproportionate effect on the disabled because of the frequency of visits tends to be higher and their income tends to be lower/limited like mine because of my disability. Article 8 - Respect for Private and Family Life - the level of charges will prohibit this for me.</p>	4.9, 4.15, 4.21
26 Resident in area	<p>I am very against this proposal. Not only is it not at all necessary, it is just more money being taken from people. I do not live at **** but stay there on a regular occasion, this will make it hard for me as I cannot get a permit. A small card was posted to this address stating this proposal, also saying a questionnaire was carried out. Well it certainly wasn't at this address! This is pushing people further and further out of the city. It will affect local businesses, school runs/pick ups, rush hour etc. It will be chaos! I feel you should reconsider your proposal. I believe the homes near the pr.park station are for the proposal as there are commuters that park in that area. Why not just make it permits by the station or even better make permits at certain times. E.g m-f 10-11/3-6 similar to that of queens park area. This will benefit all residents in the pp triangle area. A permit is £120 per year on top of council tax, car tax, etc etc. It is not fair! On top of that the buses have increased in price again! There seems to be no end to the costs in the last couple of years in Brighton and Hove. Do not go ahead with this proposal!</p>	4.9, 4.16, 4.17

27 resident in area	<p>I previously objected to the scheme and submitted my comments on the council's web site in December 2013. Many of my comments were not even reported to members so I will repeat all of them again as I consider that they are relevant objections to the TRO. It will not solve parking problems but will simply extend them to a larger area on the boundary of the proposed zone. Displaced parking will shift north of Preston Drove and east of Ditchling Road, severely affecting adjoining residents and businesses. It will add significantly to our running costs and, as a result, it will also affect house prices in the area. Not only will we have to pay to park, but our visitors will also have to pay. When work is undertaken on our property, repair costs will increase in order to cover the extra parking charges. The increase in costs come at a time when living standards are falling and therefore we will be doubly affected. The parking charges are excessive. In Brighton & Hove parking charges are above the national average. The council is making huge profits from parking and this may well be unlawful. Even the government has recognised that charges are excessive and is trying to rein in councils. The high cost of parking in Brighton & Hove is also affecting the economy of the city. It will remove parking spaces in the area. The extent of double yellow lines is excessive and this should be reduced along the side roads. Shorter yellow lines are permitted in the Highway Code. An example where parking places have recently been lost is along Stanford Avenue where new bus bays have been provided. The bays along Stanford Avenue are longer than those along Beaconsfield Villas despite there being an infrequent bus route along Stanford Avenue – Beaconsfield Villas is on a major bus route. In Hove much shorter bus bays have been provided, thus minimising the effects on parking. The period for the parking restrictions is excessive (eleven hours) and is above the national average. Five day or seven day parking restrictions are being offered but other areas of the city operate for six days – this period should also have been proposed. Two areas in the city have parking restrictions for just two hours per day and this option should also have been offered. If the zone is to be extended, it should be on a light touch basis. The payment method for visitors is unfair as it discriminates against those who do not have mobile telephones, do not have "paybyphone" accounts or who want to pay by cash to avoid extra phone charges. The proposed scheme is likely to result in anti-social behaviour. In previous reports the council has claimed that there will be no implications for crime and disorder. However, Sussex Police have already contacted local residents in our area concerning criminal damage to vehicles resulting from the expansion of the parking zone. We have witnessed road rage and anti-social behaviour caused by the displaced parking. The consultation is flawed as it does not take into account all affected residents and businesses. People from outside the proposed zone are excluded. The consultation leaflet is misleading as it states that there might be displaced parking. This indicates that there is some uncertainty and there might be no displaced parking. Why cannot the council be honest? There will definitely be displaced parking if the scheme goes ahead. We objected to the earlier scheme when initial consultation took place because of our fears of displaced parking. Our views were dismissed because we did not live in the adjoining area, although we were vulnerable to displaced parking. We then objected when the draft Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised but again our comments were dismissed. In fact, the majority of people in the proposed zone objected to the TRO because they were unhappy about the exact details of the scheme, but it still went ahead. The council previously gave a commitment not to extend parking zones in streets that were not in favour of parking restrictions. This commitment was given by a leading councillor at public meetings and in separate committee reports. Nevertheless the scheme went ahead. The council has created parking problems in the area where previously the level of parking was generally manageable. Sussex Police recognise that associated crime has increased. Instead of extending the parking zone, the existing parking zone should be reduced. It was clear at a recent public meeting that residents in the adjoining zone were unhappy with the new parking restrictions. Commenting on the proposed scheme is futile, as the council has already made up its mind to extend the zone. Our area was identified long ago for parking restrictions. The council is playing one group of residents off against the other to enable the zones to be extended. Even when the majority of residents were against the scheme, projects have gone ahead. Raising money appears to be the main drive for expanding the zones, not solving parking problems. Reducing the cost of permits would make the scheme more bearable to local residents and businesses. Additional comments I know my comments will be dismissed based on previous experience. I wrote to the council to question the legality of not reporting all my views in committee reports. I also questioned the legality of commencing schemes even before the consultation process has been completed and before councillors have had an opportunity to review the submissions. I did receive a holding reply promising a response but then I received a further reply stating that a further reply would not be appropriate; this was two months after I sent my letter. I note that temporary markings have already appeared in</p>	4.9- 4.23 incl.
28 resident in area	<p>cost of the permits, no way can £120 per car per year be in anyway justifiable. Should be in line with other councils, say the many central London boroughs (Barnet or Westminster for instance) which are around £40. Which is in line with the costs of administering the scheme. If it is to go ahead I commute on a motorcycle and can see no provision on the plans for a motorcycle bay anywhere near my property, Beaconsfield Villas is half a mile long, so walking to and from my machine every morning carrying lock and cover up to half a mile is not feasible.</p>	4.9, NB a motorcycle bay is provided close to the objector
29 resident in area	<p>1. The scheme general unnecessary and certainly is too restrictive. There are generally no parking problems before 8pm most days and certainly at weekends. At the very most this scheme should only apply Mondays to Fridays. There were certainly severe problems immediately after the introduction of the area J parking restrictions on 1st July 2013. This significantly eased in January 2014, we assumed because second permits were issued to residents. Since January parking is about the same as it has always been - we have been resident in **** years. We can both currently park outside or very near our house before 8pm almost all of the time. Being forced to pay £240/year without any benefit, as the scheme does not apply after 8pm, is unfair. 2. The issuing of only 1 permit per household will force either myself or my wife to park outside of the restriction zone for 6 months. We both work outside of Brighton in different locations. This will undoubtedly put pressure on the adjoining area north of Preston Drove, forcing the inevitable consultation in that area and eventual extending of the scheme further North. It could also mean at least a 10 minute walk to and from my car twice a day, 5 days a week for 6 months</p>	4.13, 4.9, 4.16, 4.19, 4.20
30 resident in area	<p>Can I ask when was the last time that somebody actually came and looked at the parking situation in the "Fiveways Triangle"? It seems a lot of noise was made when Zone J came into force (Facebook campaigns, angry meetings with councillors, that sort of NIMBY thing) which seemed to expedite the extension northwards of the zone. The "problems" (and I use the word sarcastically, more on that in a moment) appear to have been in a large part caused by the "one permit per household" rule which was applied (I'm told) for the first 6 months of the new zone. It was in this same 6 months that my neighbours campaigned so vigorously for "something to be done". That 6 months has now passed and (to my eyes at least) the parking issues that existed (such as they did) have largely abated. However that 6 month period gave people ample opportunity to knee-jerk and we are now in a situation where the zone extension is pretty much a done-deal. This is in spite of the fact that if you drive around the area now there is an abundance of parking spaces for residents and visitors alike. I am deeply suspicious of how events have unraveled. It seems that the "one permit per household" rule is designed, in part, to ensure that this sort of community campaigning occurs with each new zone. Displacement is going to happen again and again (I have two cars in my household, so one of them is now going to have to be parked north of Preston Drove for 6 months) until, inevitably, Brighton and Hove is 100% covered by CPZs. Which is disappointing for the reasons I'm sure many have already told you - but to which you are largely immune or unmoved. But my point is this, I'm sitting here now on a sunny Sunday afternoon opposite a very busy Blakers Park. At this moment, from my front window, I can see spaces for around 15-20 cars. It is like this every day (unless the Albion are playing at the Amex, then we get cars parked by people travelling to the match from London Road station), there is no parking problem that I can see, there is no need to go to expense of installing and running a CPZ. THERE IS NO PARKING PROBLEM. I assume this will fall of deaf ears, but I wanted to write it down anyway. I look forward to paying for the privilege of continuing to be able to park outside my own front door, except for with my second car, which I'll have to go out and move every night... Yours, in increasing frustration at how deep Brighton and Hove City Council wants to reach into my pockets,</p>	4.9, 4.13, 4.14, 4.16, 4.20, 4.23
31 Business in area	<p>"The Council's reasons for proposing the above named Orders is to improve parking management in the areas concerned for the benefit of residents, visitors and local businesses and to encourage a greater degree of turn over of parking." Unfortunately there has been no benefit at all to my small local business in fact there has been a gross loss of income due to the knock on effect of changes to parking in Zone J in July 2013. I would also like to apply for a disabled bay outside my business as some of my patients have Disabled blue Badges.</p>	4.17, 4.18, 4.32
32 resident outside area	<p>proposal will intensify pressure on nearby areas that are not within a parking zone. 2. Given that most homes do not have garages, there is no option for residents but to pay. 3. The proposed charge is excessive; it is far more than the cost of administering the scheme and must include a large element of additional taxation by the Council; in other parts of the country local parking schemes are operated for as little as £30 per annum per vehicle and commonly around £50 per annum.</p>	4.9, 4.16
33 resident outside area	<p>I object to the extension of parking restrictions - i.e. making people pay for parking in these areas. because - any parking problem is created by the council only to make money. the proposals claim to improve amenities, improve flow of traffic and to avoid danger ??? cut the nonsense and admit that it's to make money. people would rather not pay for parking than pay very much - we pay road tax !! remember ? there was never ever any parking problems in this area until the council started putting paid restrictions in place - and then make the streets adjacent more packed with cars to avoid paying, even on sundays until 8 pm, is worse than a lot of London. its only to make money so admit it - its a form of extortion. if you want to make an area more safe with access to amenities then do it with out extorting money from residents that have chosen to live here because of the absence of paid parking.</p>	4.9, 4.18

34 resident outside area	I live in **** and it is already almost impossible to park in my street. Does the council really believe that everyone in Preston drove and other roads with the new restrictions, will pay to park ? No , what they will do is park in roads like**** in order to avoid paying and will mean that we won't be able to park in our own street li have no problem paying for spaces to park in ****so why doesn't the council extend the scheme ? Every day there are lorries ,vans ,and travellers vehicles parked in Preston drove. Where will these move to ? **** that's where. Virtually everyone i know in the street is against the proposal BUT would accept the proposal being extended to ****. We had a cafe open in**** last year and that alone has meant massive parking restrictions as their clients take up what little space is available to park. Please re consider the scheme.	4.16,
35 resident outside area	With regard to the above proposal, I have absolutely no objection to the purpose and objectives of the suggested parking zone extension, it seems to me eminently sensible and addresses a real problem.BUT as a resident of ****Road I am horrified because it is absolutely inevitable that the problem you are addressing here will immediately transfer to **** roads at the very minimum. Please could you tell me a) why you are not introducing this across the whole of Fiveways in order to mitigate this instantly, b) what measures you have n place to counter theparking hell which is about to descend on these areas now just outside a designated parking zone? Given that evenings are alreadyblocked and there is much dangerous parkingacross corners you will create the exact scenarios north of the parking extension which you have identified as the reason for the extension in the first place	4.16,
36 resident outside area	displacement north of Preston Drive, affect on Fiveways businesses, reasons given are weak, another way of increasing council tax.	4.16, 4.17, 4.9
37 resident outside area	The proposed Controlled Parking Zone will cause major overspill for roads north of Preston Drive. I would therefore like to ask the council to monitor the overspill situation north of Preston Drive as a matter of urgency. Residential roads north of Preston Drive are already experiencing considerable pressure in terms of the parking situation. The Controlled Parking Zone needs to be extended to include residential roads north of Preston Drive.	4.16,
38 resident outside area	When I completed the questionnaire, I was of the understanding that I was voting for or against the scheme as defined in the documentation. There was no mention that the results would be looked at on a road by road bases. I votes against the scheme.I now understand that it has been proposed that the lower half of Preston Drive is not to be in the scheme. This was not on "Option" in the questionnaire and I certainly would not have voted for it. I now find myself in the worst of all possible situations being just outside the scheme. I would not qualify for a permit and all people not wishing to pay will park outside my house.I was not consulted on the proposed "Half of Preston Drive" solution. I accept that most people have voted for the scheme and so would propose that either a) The full Preston Triangle scheme as originally outlined is implemented (i.e. including all of Preston Drive), orb) The "Residential Side of the lower part of Preston Drive is made "Permit Holders Only"	4.16, 4.14, 4.26,
39 resident outside area	I am writing to strongly raise my objection to the above notice which has been sparsely posted on various lamp-posts around the area.I live in *** which is one of the side streets off Surrenden Road and 2 roads away from the area of the proposed restrictions. While I do not own a car myself, there is one in our household. I have been continually concerned by the increase in parking restrictions from the centre of the city moving further out into the suburban areas. The effect that this has had has been to result in an increase in vehicles parking further out of the City. It does not solve any problem of parking but moves it to other areas that were previously less affected. I am therefore very concerned that this is an attempt to introduce more parking pressure in the area to the North of Preston Drive and ultimately make the case for parking restrictions in the adjoining areas. I am strongly opposed to this as a long-time resident of Brighton as it also affects the ability for visitors to the area to park. We have indeed seen an increase in commercial vehicle parking on Surrenden Road and the adjoining streets and I believe that these new parking restrictions will similarly increase such pressure. In terms of the maximum level of metered and permitted areas I am strongly of the opinion that the restriction time zones are excessive and these should be reduced from 10am - 4pm (both residents permit and metered parking) and not apply at weekends given that this would allow local residents the opportunity to gain parking during off-peak hours while restricting some of the commercial vehicle traffic. In addition the areas should be permitted 24hours for commercial vehicles as we have seen an increase in out of hours parking (effectively storage) of commercial vehicles. I look forward to you consideration of this amendment. Furthermore I would request that you consider dropping this proposal in its entirety.	4.16, 4.19,
40 resident outside area	this will almost certainly cause a major problem with overspill parking north of Preston Drive if those affected by the controlled parking zone fail to buy permits for all their vehicles.I would like to register my strong opposition to this taking place and request that, should this in fact take place, the roads north of Preston Drive be included in the scheme from the outset to prevent these problems from occurring.There is currently just about adequate parking for the residents in these areas and any increase in parking by residents of other areas will create a nightmare situation for residents.	4.16,
41 resident outside area	I am writing with regards to the planned extension to Zone J as I am a resident of **** which does not appear to be included in the new restrictions. The parking on **** is already very busy and I often have to park a fair distance away from my house; it is necessary for me to have a car as I am a ***** so I therefore need a car to attend meetings and visit service users. I believe that if you only have the Zone J extension up to Preston drove you will repeat the problems which already exist on the roads lower down.	4.16
42 resident outside area	The residents of**** originally included in the scheme laid out in the consultation document but now omitted, will be adversely effected by your proposal. The other houses that are on the stretch of road being omitted all have off-street parking,We would welcome a fresh consultation for the stretch of road in front of ****now that the residents of these houses know about the proposed modification to the zone.If the stretch of road in front of the six terraced houses were for residents only, there would still be plenty of uncontrolled parking spaces on the South side of the road for use by the tennis and cycle clubs. And would it not also be possible to allow 15 minutes parking for parents dropping off and picking up from the nursery?	4.16 4.26
43 resident outside area	I am a resident in****, an area north of Preston Drive and the proposed parking zone in the Preston Park triangle.Whilst I appreciate the difficult parking issues that we face in this area on a day to day basis, I am very concerned about the knock on effect that the controlled parking zone is going to have on our road and roads north of Preston Drive.We are already in a position that we are not able to find a parking space after about 6pm and I foresee that this will be made even worse when controlled parking is introduced. All the commuter cars that currently park in the Preston park triangle will move to our roads and anyone who doesn't have a permit for their vehicle.I would like to request that the parking situation is monitored in roads north of Preston Drive following the introduction of controlled parking and that the council consult on the idea of a parking scheme in this area as well.	4.16

44 resident outside area	I'm writing to object to this Traffic Order: 1) unless and until the Council commits to carrying out 'before and after' surveys of on street parking in the area north of Preston Drive and 2) the Council commits to reviewing its Parking Strategy to include the area north of Preston Drive as one that will be consulted on for future Controlled Parking Zone. The reasons for the objections are that the extension of CPZ J is likely to cause displaced parking into areas north of Preston Drive. The Council's survey showed that there were 1.3 vehicles per respondent household. The assertion that people with vehicles were more likely to respond is not backed up with any evidence. Not all residents in the zone will buy permits for all their own or visitors' vehicles. This is particularly the case for households with more than one vehicle, including business vehicles (about 10% of respondents to the Council's survey had 1.9 vehicles per household. Business vehicle permits are more expensive than vehicles for private use so are more likely to be parked outside the area). It is undemocratic to ignore the views of people who live outside the proposed CPZ area. The Council report ignored the concerns of the 81 respondents to the survey who lived outside the area, despite the acknowledged problem of displacement. I trust that the views of all respondents will be reported and taken into account by the Council.	4.16, 4.14,
45 resident outside area	I'm writing to ask you to take steps not to spread the misery of displaced parking. Please consider the effect of displaced parking outside residents' parking zones. The streets in the northern section of the existing Zone J are well below capacity which has caused parking problems in the Triangle. Those of us who live just outside the Triangle to the north are already seeing extra cars in our streets. This will only get worse after the new scheme is introduced as residents in the Triangle can't or won't pay for permits for their own or their business's vehicles or for visitors. The Council did not consult people living in the streets to the north of Preston Drive which will receive the displaced vehicles, I requested that we were consulted, why wasn't this done? Surely it is obvious that the already overcrowded streets north of Preston Drive will be adversely affected by the new scheme. I think this is undemocratic and shows that there is no "overall" plan for residents parking in Brighton or commitment to "consultation". Please do not approve this without first assessing the effect of the proposed extension to the surrounding streets.	4.1,
46 resident outside area	I live in ****on the edge of a proposed new parking zone. please can **** also be included in your monitoring of the area? as its obvious that any changes locally will have a huge impact on our road.	4.16
47 resident outside area	Parking in**** currently, is far from easy and 40% of the time we have to park on another street, so we would request that the Council monitors the parking situation closely after the introduction of the above scheme and that we are consulted on a parking scheme in our roads.	4.16
48 resident outside area	1) There is nothing in the area to require such parking restrictions especially in the roads coming south from Preston Drive, there is no station, no offices, no factories and no shops, which equals NO PARKING PROBLEMS. 2) This is purely a money-making exercise and will cause problems where at the moment there aren't any. 3) It will push cars north of Preston Drive causing parking congestion. 4) Parking North of Preston Drive will be affected with the knock on effect of the council insisting on extending the residents parking area north of Fiveways. 5) Not enough residents vouchers will be allowed so although people will be paying for the right to park it will not guarantee a space, again a money-making scheme. I could go on further but can't really see the point as in my experience you people at the council don't listen to the residents anyway. What I would like to know (and I would like a genuine reason) why is this parking scheme being considered? Residents in those roads don't want it, there are already charges to park around Preston Park so the council already gets revenue from that which must make a fair amount of money. The whole scheme is pointless and a waste of council tax payers money plus we pay another fee on top of our council tax! I would love to know a true breakdown of where all the parking revenue goes to in Brighton and Hove, it certainly does not benefit residents or motorists!! also request that overspill parking is monitored. Also to consult fully on a scheme for North of Preston Drive where the residents are really against such proposals.	4.23, 4.9, 4.16, 4.20
49 resident outside area	As a resident of **** I am mailing to oppose the introduce of resident parking to the Preston Drive area; all this will do is cause more parking problems within the area. Already there are many cars that double park over night, causing a danger during the morning commute; there are a number of cars that also mount the pavement. This will cause a massive problem if more cars are vying for the few spaces that we have. I also disagree with the principle of resident's parking, as this does not improve the amount of spaces to park; parking is not eased and permits become a money-making scheme with little benefits for residents. It does not solve the parking problems within Brighton and just pushes congestion into the next 'zone' that has no restrictions. We have already noticed this within **** from restrictions further down. Please stop the resident parking scheme and instead spend the money on improving the parking within the area (eg introduce herring bone systems).	4.16, 4.9, 4.13, 4.24
50 resident outside area	I am concerned about the impact on parking in roads north of the scheme. Every time a new parking restriction is implemented in this area it just shifts those that park locally and are non-residents further out of the city into other roads and does not solve the problem itself.	4.16
51 resident outside area	As a resident who lives and works in the local area I find it very frustrating that the consultations are very limited as the parking issues impact on a far greater area that those roads that will inevitably have parking the restrictions. I like to shop in the local area; sometimes I am in my car returning from an appointment / work and I want to stop off and purchase goods from local shops. I also choose to visit doctors and other services in the five ways area. I am very concerned about the knock on effect of all these parking restrictions. 1. Cost of residents permits & the allocated visitor permits. (there is a definite need for more flexibility here - when I visit elderly friends I might go for a few hours I do not need a days permit !) 2. Impact on local businesses & their trade. Is this being monitored independently ? 3. Impact on elderly residents and visitors (particularly in relation to visitor permits) 4. Displaced parking - the impact on my road and others in the area. It will & does happen - we have seen it all over the city. When you travel routes daily you see a different picture to the odd monitoring research undertaken by people who comment that they can't see any. 5. What will happen to households with more than one car. In a city as expensive as ours many partners in a family have to work and take the work where they can. As a consequence both may need cars for work. I myself needed to have a car as part of my work; my husband also has a 50 minute drive to his job that is not accessible by public transport. Not all of have the choice of working close to where we live with accessible public transport. 6. The parking zone must be looked at strategically with other local issues and developments. e.g You have encouraged both Vardean, Dorothy Stringer and Balfour School to expand their numbers. Land space for new classrooms has meant in some cases staff parking has been moved. As a consequence staff now park in the surrounding area. This has had an impact on local parking. I have lived in Brighton for over 40 years now and I can honestly say I am very concerned at what has happened in local government in recent years. Parking has become increasingly expensive; as has public transport. As a consequence I visit the centre of the town less frequently. (& spend less!) I do visit Lewes more although sadly I often have to drive; I used to park near London Rd station & take the train in the day when there was plenty of local parking space. Consultations are limited & you often only find out about them by accident (am not an Argus reader) and sadly I am becoming increasingly cynical about whether the various committees actually truly listen.	4.9, 4.10, 4.17, 4.18, 4.21, 4.20, 4.22

52 place of worship outside area	Impact on visitors, need for free time limited spaces to facilitate parking, users with mobility issues, displacement	4.1, 4.9, 4.16, 4.17, 4.18, 4.21
53 Objects, name but no address given	I am writing to protest against your proposal to implement parking permits from 9-8pm in this area. Firstly I think the questionnaire was invalid as after the 1st yes/no question you then give people a series of defined options. Question 2 was not prefixed with 'if yes'so people were very likely to ring a choice even if they disagreed with the project overall. We had no opportunity to vote for the light touch option. The only argument I've ever heard against this was some people in Hove complained about this when it was implemented. Well that would be true of anything. No numbers, no statistics mentioned. People who are car free now have to get involved with management and organisation costs and arrangements for builders, visitors etc in order to make things easier for the (polluting) car owning majority.	4.9, 4.14
54 Objects, name but no address given	No-one can object to parking controls close to the city centre or transport hubs, but this area is nowhere near these. By implication, one must assume that once this area is controlled, then the adjacent areas will also eventually become controlled as a result of the displacement of cars to these adjoining free-parking areas. Thus, eventually, the whole of the city will become controlled, as the whole of Hove is already below the A27. Its time a halt is called, and many of these measures rolled back, NOT extended.	4.16, 4.18
Site specific objections/comments		
Who	Summary	Referenced paragraph in main report
55 Doctors practice	Request for doctors bay	4.33
56 resident in area	Objects to car club bay in Edburton Avenue/loss of residents parking in short road/other car club bays nearby	4.28
57 resident in area	Objects to car club bay in Edburton Avenue/loss of residents parking in short road/other car club bays nearby	4.28
58 Petition from 11 residents of Waldegrave Rd	Requests relocation and extension of motorcycle bay to improve facility	4.3
59 petition from 17 residents of waldegrave Road	Requests relocation and shortening of 4 hr shared pay and display area/swapping with permit holders only area at the lower end of Waldegrave Road to improve facilities for residents and for the removal of a redundant disabled bay	4.31, 4.27
60 resident in area	Objects to car club bay in Edburton Avenue/loss of residents parking in short road/other car club bays nearby	4.28
61 Resident in area	Request to provide disabled parking bay near therapy centre and shops to assist business and disabled access	4.32
62 resident in area	Request to provide disabled parking bay near therapy centre and shops to assist business and disabled access	4.32
63 resident in area	Objects to car club bay in Edburton Avenue/loss of residents parking in short road/other car club bays nearby	4.28
64 resident in area	Objects to car club bay in Edburton Avenue/loss of residents parking in short road/other car club bays nearby	4.28
65 resident in area	Objects to car club bay in Edburton Avenue/loss of residents parking in short road/other car club bays nearby	4.28
66 resident in area	Objects to car club bay in Edburton Avenue/loss of residents parking in short road/other car club bays nearby	4.28
67 resident in area	Objects to car club bay in Edburton Avenue/loss of residents parking in short road/other car club bays nearby	4.28

68 resident in area	Objects to car club bay in Edburton Avenue/loss of residents parking in short road/other car club bays nearby	4.28
69 resident in area	Objects to car club bay in Edburton Avenue/loss of residents parking in short road/other car club bays nearby	4.28
70 resident in area	Supports extension of CPZ in Preston Drove west of Harrington Villas	4.26
71 resident in area	Objects to marking of white line across disputed crossover	4.29
72 resident in area	Objects to marking of white line across disputed crossover	4.29
73 resident in area	Objects to disabled bay as being unused, objects to provision of all motorcycle parking as being unnecessary, objects to Pay & display machines as being unnecessary, objects to excessive street furniture	4.27, 4.11, 4.12, NB Motorcycle bays are required because m/cs cannot park in
74 resident in area	Objects to 11hr spaces in Cleveland road as they may encourage vehicle dwellers, objects to pedal cycle parking bays as it will not be used as residents keep cycles in their homes	4.34, 4.35