

**Appendix A – Initial leaflet drop consultation reports**

- 1. Preston Park Avenue area report**
- 2. Preston Park Station area report**
- 3. Stanford area report**

# Preston Park Avenue report

## Methodology

In October 2007 a letter was sent to 539 properties in the Preston Park Station area covering 3 roads. The letter explained that ward councillors and councillor officers had received a number of reports of parking problems in the areas and wanted to establish if residents would like a parking scheme to be investigated and designed for their roads. A return slip at the end of the letter posed 2 questions asking residents if they wanted a parking scheme or not in their area. There was also an open text box for any additional comments.

## Headline findings

A total of 199 replies were received giving an response rate of 37%.

Over the entire area 76.5 % supported the idea of a parking scheme. 21 % did not and 2.5 % returned forms with comments but didn't vote either way. An analysis of the comments can be found in the main findings paragraph.

## Main findings

Support or opposition to the introduction of a scheme varied from road to road and is detailed in the following table on the following page.

From the respondents who gave comments in the space provided the most frequently mentioned issues were:

- A parking scheme would alleviate the need to move travellers on
- Remove all illegally parked and untaxed vehicles
- A parking scheme would discourage commercial vehicles
- Introduce traffic calming measures ( i.e. speed bumps)
- A resistance to having to pay for parking
- Issues over the wording of the letter

Appendix A

Road	Number of properties	Response rate %	Yes	No	No reply	% of total
Preston Park Avenue	341	47	82	15.5	2.5	81
Preston Drove	49	32.5	37.5	62.5	0	8
Preston Road	149	15	63.5	32	4.5	11

# Preston Park Station report

## Methodology

In October 2007 a letter was sent to 1410 properties in the Preston Park Station area covering 19 roads. The letter explained that ward councillors and councillor officers had received a number of reports of parking problems in the areas and wanted to establish if residents would like a parking scheme to be investigated and designed for their roads. A return slip at the end of the letter posed 2 questions asking residents if they wanted a parking scheme or not in their area. There was also an open text box for any additional comments.

## Headline findings

A total of 628 replies were received giving an response rate of 44.5%. Over the entire area 43.5% supported the idea of a parking scheme. 54% did not and 1.5% returned forms with comments but didn't vote either way. An analysis of the comments can be found in the main findings paragraph.

## Main findings

Support or opposition to the introduction of a scheme varied from road to road and is detailed in the following table.

As with all proposed schemes resident's views and experiences illustrate a polarity of opinions. The most frequently mentioned topics were:

- Any problems were due to displacement from prestonville scheme (particularly mentioned by residents in Reigate road/ Compton road) and the introduction of a scheme in this area would only lead to another area suffering displacement.
- Unwillingness to have to pay to park
- Parking problems due to commuter parking during the day – especially around the station
- No day time problems but parking impossible after 6pm
- Concern around issues of safety on Dyke Road caused by parking on cycle lane
- Concern about small businesses – whether scheme would deter visitors
- Concern that parking scheme would impact on Preston Park station and jeopardise its viability.
- If a scheme is introduced then Hampstead road/Robertson road need to be in a separate zone.
- Criticism of the phrasing of option 2 on the questionnaire
- Felt that with out the detail of how a scheme would operate they were unable to say.
- Requests for the same kind of scheme as the one around Hove Park/ light touch

Appendix A

Road	Number of properties	Response rate %	Yes	No	No reply	% of total
Tivoli Crescent	138	44	34	64.5	1.5	10
Tivoli Crescent North	45	37	37	63	0	4
Tivoli Place (unadopted)	5	80	0	100	1	.5
Tivoli Road	46	64	10.5	86	3.5	4.5
Maldon Road	114	56	6.5	92	1.5	10
Matlock road	54	54	34.5	65.5	0	4.5
Woodside Ave	17	81	61.5	30.5	8	2
Hampstead Road	93	43	75	17.5	7.5	6.5
Kingsley Road	71	60	57	40.5	2.5	6.5
Scarborough Road	34	36	66.5	33.5	0	2
Robertson Road	88	43	66	31.5	2.5	6
Millers road	129	36	27.5	72.5	0	7.5
Inwood Crescent	96	34	27.5	72.5	0	5.5
Compton Road	172	41	55	41	4	11.5
Reigate Road	97	51	83.5	16.5	0	7.5
The Drove	22	42	66.5	33.5	0	1.5

Appendix A

Wincombe road	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
South Road	45	29	15.5	77	7.5	2	
Dyke Road	140	30	44	48.5	7	7	

# Stanford Area Report

## Methodology

In October 2007 a letter was sent to 4062 properties in the Stanford area covering 92 roads. The letter explained that ward councillors and councillor officers had received a number of reports of parking problems in the areas and wanted to establish if residents would like a parking scheme to be investigated and designed for their roads. A return slip at the end of the letter posed 2 questions asking residents if they wanted a parking scheme or not in their area. There was also an open text box for any additional comments.

## Headline findings

A total of 1778 replies were received giving a response rate of 44%.

Over the entire area 32% supported the idea of a parking scheme. 64.5% did not and 3.5% returned forms with comments but didn't vote either way. An analysis of the comments can be found in the main findings paragraph.

## Main findings

Support or opposition to the introduction of a scheme varied from road to road and is detailed in the table on the next page (**bold** = 50/50 votes, *italic* = yes votes).

A large area was consulted comprising the most of the Stanford Ward area bounded by the Old Shoreham Road, Dyke Road and Dyke Road Avenue (up to the A27 junction roundabout) a line south to the railway line and a West to East line towards Bhasvic.

Positive responses were reflected in two main hotspot areas consisting of an area to the East of the City Park development encroaching along The Droveaway and Woodruff Avenue and a further area around Radinden Manor Roads and The Martlets to the West of Dyke Road Park.

The questionnaire made it clear that no decision on a scheme would be made yet 12% of respondents requested restrictions similar to the single yellow line scheme Hove Park Road Area and 2% of respondents said they favoured a light touch scheme or variant of such. Of the 12% who made comments that they would like yellow line restrictions:

- 33% had voted yes to a parking scheme
- 55% had voted no to parking scheme and the remaining
- 12% had voted "no reply"

The most frequently mentioned other topics were:

- 9% of respondents expressed the view that parking problems were concerned with commuters the City Park/ Legal and General offices. Of these a significant number expressed the opinion that the financial burden should be born by the business or BHC for allowing the development.
- 8% of respondents expressed the view that a scheme was not necessary, either because of the existence of off-street parking or because of a lack of parking related issues.

- 1% of respondents said they felt the road was too narrow for a scheme and that it would result in the loss of parking spaces.

Other comments included:

- Concern over knock-on effects from other schemes.
- Concerns about the consultation process.
- Some residents wanted traffic calming measures in addition to a scheme.
- Concerns that current arrangements were not being enforced adequately.
- Felt that the addition of associated street furniture/ yellow lines would ruin aesthetics of the area.



Appendix A

Road	Number of properties	Response rate %	Yes	No	No reply	% of total
Aldrington Avenue	58	60	14	83	3	2.0
Amherst Crescent	70	60	38	59.5	2.5	2.4
<b>Barrowfield Close</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	-	<b>0.1</b>
Barrowfield Drive	20	35	29	71	-	0.4
Bennett Avenue	5	80	25	50	25	0.2
Bennett Drive	70	57	32.5	65	2.5	0.2
<i>Bishops Road</i>	40	50	55	40	5	1.1
Charles Close	18	55.5	30	70	-	0.6
Chartfield	22	54	17	83	-	0.7
<i>Charfield Way</i>	3	67	100	-	-	0.1
Cobton Drive	56	45	4	96	-	1.4
Court Farm Road	160	20	22	72	6	1.8
Cranmer Avenue	57	49	29	68	3	1.6
Deanway	17	41	29	57	1	0.4
Downside	25	48	25	38	17	1.7
Dyke Road	66	45	43	53	3	1.7

Appendix A

Road	Number of properties	Response rate %	Yes	No	No reply	% of total
Edward Avenue	24	58	29	71	-	0.8
<b>Edward Close</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	-	<b>0.1</b>
Elizabeth Avenue	57	51	21	76	3	1.6
<i>Elizabeth Close</i>	4	50	100	-	-	0.1
Elm Close	6	50	-	100	-	0.3
Elrington Road	15	53	37.5	62.5	-	0.4
Eridge Road	10	30	33	67	-	0.2
Frant Road	9	55	40	60	-	0.3
<i>Fulmar Close</i>	15	70	72	14	14	0.4
<b>Goldstone Close</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0.3</b>
Goldstone Crescent	211	40	36	60	4	4.8
<b>Goldstone Lane</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>50</b>	-	<b>50</b>	<b>0.1</b>
Goldstone Way	42	40	18	82	-	0.1
Greyfriars Close	13	46	0	100	0	0.3
Hill Brow	59	51	10	83	7	1.7
Hill Drive	54	57	45	52	3	1.7

**Appendix A**

<b>Road</b>	<b>Number of properties</b>	<b>Response rate %</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No reply</b>	<b>% of total</b>
Hove Park Gardens	6	17	0	100	0	0.1
Hove Park Road	75	45	15	76.5	9	1.1
<i>Hove Park Way</i>	46	78	61	28	11	2
Kelly Road	5	40	0	100	-	0.1
<i>Kestrel Close</i>	13	46	83	17	-	0.3
King George I Drive	70	54	5	95	-	2.1
Lloyd Close	9	44	25	75	-	0.2
Lloyd Road	29	41	33	50	17	0.7
Lullington Avenue	41	63	15	85	-	1.5
Mallory Road	39	74	31	65.6	3.5	1.6
Meadow Close	22	45	20	60	20	0.6
Merlin Close	12	58	29	71	-	0.4
Milcote Avenue	26	77	5	95	-	1.1
Mill Drive	63	60	16	84	-	2.1
Nevill Avenue	147	46	42	55	3	3.8
Nevill Close	8	37.5	33	67	-	0.3

Appendix A

Road	Number of properties	Response rate %	Yes	No	No reply	% of total
Nevill Gardens	8	62.5	40	60	-	0.3
Nevill Place	8	62.5	20	80	-	0.3
Nevill Road	267	40	36	63	1	6.0
Nevill Way	18	67	25	75	-	0.7
Newtown Road	24	0.4	0	100	-	0.1
Old Shoreham Road	345	18	15	38	8	3.4
Onslow Road	19	74	43	50	7	0.8
Orchard Avenue	29	38	18	73	9	0.6
<b>Orchard Gardens</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50</b>	-	<b>0.8</b>
Orchard Road	31	10	0	100	-	0.2
Orpen Road	17	47	37.5	50	12.5	0.4
Park View Road	65	28	39	61	-	1
Queen Alexandra Avenue	19	42	25	62.5	12.5	0.4
Queen Caroline Close	12	42	20	80	-	0.3
Queen Mary Avenue	10	50	0	100	0	0.3
Queen Victoria Avenue	89	42	24	76	-	2.1

**Appendix A**

<b>Road</b>	<b>Number of properties</b>	<b>Response rate %</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No reply</b>	<b>% of total</b>
Radinden Drive	9	33	-	100	-	0.2
Radinden Manor Road	24	50	25	75	-	0.7
Rigden Road	23	61	14	86	-	0.8
Sandringham Close	17	53	11	90	-	0.5
Sandringham Drive	57	44	8	92	-	1.4
Shirley Avenue	10	60	33	67	-	0.3
Shirley Drive	151	52	33	66	1	4.4
Shirley Road	21	71	20	80	-	0.8
St Josephs Close	39	0.5	0	100	-	0.1
Stanford Close	9	55.5	100	-	-	0.3
The Droveway	75	65	71.5	22.5	6	2.8
The Green	9	55.5	40	60	-	0.3
The Martlet	49	49	75	25	-	1.3
The Paddock	11	70	57	43	-	7
The Upper Drive	50	30	60	40	-	0.8
Tongdean Avenue	57	58	33	67	-	1.9

**Appendix A**

<b>Road</b>	<b>Number of properties</b>	<b>Response rate %</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>No reply</b>	<b>% of total</b>
Tongdean Place	2	-	-	-	-	0
<b>Tongdean Road</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>1.3</b>
Torrance Close	2	50	-	100	-	0.1
<b>Tredcroft Road</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1.2</b>
Weald Avenue	5	40	-	100	-	0.1
Windsor Close	46	35	25	75	-	0.9
Woodland Avenue	175	3	26	72	2	5.2
<i>Woodland Close</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>67</i>	<i>33</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>0.2</i>
Woodland Drive	145	42	28	70	2	3.4
Woodland Parade	8	12.5	0	100	-	0.1
Woodlands	28	50	7	93	-	0.3
<i>Woodruff Avenue</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>26</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>2</i>