

Coldean Area Match and Event Day Residents Parking Scheme Consultation Report November 2012

Background

The American Express Community Stadium was developed on a site in Falmer in 2008- 11. In January 2012 Brighton & Hove Albion FC submitted a planning application to add a further 8,500 seats to the stadium.

The neighbouring residential areas of Coldean and Moulsecoomb often suffer parking pressures on match and event days.

In June 2012 a letter was sent to all residents in the Coldean Area informing residents that the council would be consulting in the autumn for a Match and Event Day residents parking scheme. Consultation packs were subsequently sent to all properties in the Coldean and Moulsecoomb areas giving details of a free match and event day parking scheme to be funded by Brighton & Hove Albion FC.

Headline Findings

The consultation achieved a 29.5% response rate.

78.5% of respondents were in favour of the proposals for a Match and Event Day Residents Parking Scheme in the Coldean Area.

Methodology

Brighton and Hove City Council Land and Property t was used to provide 1169 property addresses in the Coldean Area of Brighton. An information leaflet, detailed maps, a questionnaire and a prepaid envelope for reply was sent to each address. Respondents were also invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal: 19 respondents (5.5%) chose this method.

A unique ID was printed on each form which can be linked back to postal addresses. Postal addresses were asked for on the on-line version of the survey. These could be cross-referenced the unique ID database to ensure that there were no duplicate submissions from households.

Plans could also be viewed at exhibitions staffed by officers from Brighton & Hove City Council at Larchwood Community Café, Waldron Avenue, Coldean on Thursday 27 September, 2012, 1.30pm to 7.30pm.

There was also an unstaffed exhibition at Hove Town Hall, Norton Road from Monday 1 October, 2012 to Friday 26 October, 2012, 9am to 5.30pm.

There are 33 streets in the proposed scheme area.

345 responses¹ were received giving a response rate of 29.5%.

Results

Q1 Are you in favour of a residents parking scheme in your street?²

Yes		No		Total
No.	%	No.	%	
266	78.5	73	21.5	339

Results on a street by street basis were as follows:

Street	No. properties mailed	No. responses received	Response rate %	Yes		No	
				No.	%	No.	%
Arlington Crescent	14	5	36	2	40	3	60
Ashburnham Close	4	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ashburnham Drive	38	16	42	12	75	4	25
Beatty Avenue	112	22	19.5	17	77	5	23
Coldean Lane	81	33	41	29	88	4	12
Haig Avenue	23	8	35	8	100	0	0
Hawkhurst Road	154	36	23	23	64	13	36
Highfields	14	4	28.5	3	75	1	25
Ingham Drive	27	6	22	3	50	3	50
Kenwards	12	2	17	2	100	0	0
Middleton Rise	29	9	31	7	78	2	22
Monk Close	12	2	17	2	100	0	0
Nanson Road	15	3	20	2	67	1	33
Park Close	18	7	39	7	100	0	0
Park Road	60	33	55	27	82	6	18
Reeves Hill	18	6	33	6	100	0	0
Ridge View	21	9	43	7	78	2	22
Roundway	37	11	30	9	82	2	18
Rushlake Close	19	9	47	8	89	1	11
Rushlake Road	109	44	40	35	79.5	9	20.5
Saunders Hill	37	12	32	8	67	4	33
Selham Close	11	2	18	2	100	0	0
Standean Close	15	5	33	3	60	2	40
Talbot Crescent	7	2	28.5	2	100	0	0
The Byway	10	2	20	2	100	0	0

¹ Responses where no street name was given (x7) have been removed from the analysis but included in an Appendix.

² 6 responses where people have not replied whether they are in favour of the proposed scheme have been removed from the analysis of this question.

The Charltons	16	3	19	3	100	0	0
The Meads	16	7	44	5	71	2	29
Twyford Road	34	5	15	5	100	0	0
Waldron Avenue	59	3	5	2	67	1	33
Walton Bank	29	11	38	9	82	2	18
Woburn Place	50	6	12	5	83	1	17
Wolseley Road	50	13	26	8	61.5	5	38.5
Woodview Close	6	3	50	3	100	0	0
Total	1169	339	29	266	78.5	73	21.5

NB: Response rates in some streets have been poor, in particular Waldron Avenue at only 5%.

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.

	No. responses	% responses
Resident	333	96.5
Business owner or manager	16	4.7
Work in the area	12	3.5

Do you support the introduction of a Match and Event Day parking scheme?	Yes		No		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	
Residents	260	79	68	21	328
Business Owner or Managers	11	69	5	31	16

Residents show a higher level of support than Business owners or managers in the area.

Q3a How many cars in your household?

No. of cars	No. responses	Total No cars	%
0	40	0	12
1	135	135	41
2	113	226	34
3	35	115	10.5
4 or more	8	32	2.5
Total	331	508	100

331 respondents have at least 508 vehicles.

Q4b How many vehicles are directly associated with your business?

No. of vehicles	No. responses	Total No. vehicles	%
0	0	0	0
1	6	6	43
2	6	12	43
3	1	3	7
4 or more	1	4	7
Total	14	25	100

14 respondents had at least 25 vehicles associated with their 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 follows:

Comments	No. of times made
Concerns about enforcement of scheme	31
Concerns about paying for visitors	24
Concerns that the scheme will become a charging scheme in future	18
Scheme is not needed or not needed for the whole of Coldean	17
More parking should have been provided by the stadium/ this should have been thought through at the planning stage	14
Concerns about access for emergency vehicles and/ or buses	12
Varley Road Halls builders are causing parking problems	10
Student Parking is a problem	8
Concerns that people will sell visitor permits	7
Signs need to be clear to inform visitors and carers	6
What will penalties be for parking without permits?	2
This scheme will cause displacement parking elsewhere	2
Concerned that family and friends won't be able to visit	2
Is Amex providing extra parking at the stadium?	1
prefer that the money is used to keep travellers out	1
Want the scheme extended to cover events at Stanmer Park	1

Demographic Information

Gender

Gender	No.	%
Male	148	43
Female	143	41.5
Prefer not to say/ no reply	54	15.5
Total	345	100

Age

Age	No.	%
U18	1	0.5
18-24	10	3
25-34	18	5
35-44	38	11
45-54	51	15
55-64	54	16
65-74	37	11
75+	41	12
Prefer not to say/ no reply	95	27.5
Total	345	100³

Disability

Disability	No.	%
Yes	72	21
No	196	57
Prefer not to say/ no reply	77	22
Total	345	100

³ Does not add up to 100 due to rounding

Ethnicity

Ethnicity		No.	%
White	English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	274	79.5
	Irish	2	0.6
	Gypsy	0	0
	Traveller	0	0
	Polish	0	0
	Portuguese	0	0
	Any other white background	7	2.1
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	0	0
	Indian	1	0.3
	Pakistani	1	0.3
	Chinese	1	0.3
	Any other Asian background	0	0
Black or Black British	African	2	0.6
	Caribbean	1	0.3
	Sudanese	0	0
	Any other black background	0	0
Mixed	Asian & White	0	0
	Asian & Black African	0	0
	Asian & Black Caribbean	0	0
	White & Black African	1	0.3
	White & Black Caribbean	0	0
	Any other mixed background	0	0
Other ethnic group	Turkish	0	0
	Arab	0	0
	Japanese	0	0
	Other ethnic group	3	0.9
Prefer not to say/ no reply		52	15
Total		345	100

Seven responses were received where no street name has been given. Three of these were paper copy forms but the ID number had been removed and so could not be linked back to an address.

The other 4 were received through the consultation portal,

Of these 7, 3 were in favour, 3 were against and 1 person did not make a decision one way or the other

