

Moulsecoomb 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 2011 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 Moulsecoomb 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 an 18% response rate. Consultations for residents parking schemes normally achieve around 30%, so this response rate is low.

68% of respondents were in favour of the proposals for a Match and Event Day Residents Parking Scheme in the Moulsecoomb Area.

Methodology

Brighton and Hove City Council Land and Property Gazetteer was used to provide 2810 property addresses in the Moulsecoomb 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: 21 respondents (4%) 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 Moulsecoomb Leisure Centre, Moulsecoomb Way on Monday 24 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 46 streets in the proposed scheme area. 505 valid responses¹ were received giving a response rate of 18%.

Results

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

The results of this question are presented in the table below and for the area split into north and south of Moulsecoomb Way³. The area north of Moulsecoomb Way is closer to the football stadium and therefore more likely to suffer parking pressures on match and event days.

	Yes		No		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	
Whole of Moulsecoomb Area	338	68	160	32	498
North of Moulsecoomb Way	173	79	47	21	220
South of Moulsecoomb Way	165	60	112	40	277

Results for north and south Moulsecoomb on a street by street basis were as follows:

North Moulsecoomb	No. properties mailed	No. responses received	Response rate %	Yes		No	
				No.	%	No.	%
Appledore Road	42	6	13	3	50	3	50
Ashurst Road	62	28	45	25	89	3	11
Barcombe Place	8	4	50	4	100	0	0
Barcombe Road	90	18	20	15	83	3	17
Bolney Road	48	11	23	6	54	5	46
Chailey Road	64	13	20	13	100	0	0
Eastergate Road	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Egginton Close	16	6	37.5	6	100	0	0
Egginton Road	50	19	38	16	84	3	16
Firston Close	10	2	20	1	50	1	50
Halland Road	74	17	23	12	70.5	5	29.5
Lucraft Road	26	10	38	8	80	2	20
Moulsecoomb Way	237	28	12	20	71	8	29
Newick Road	158	22	14	21	95	1	5
Ringmer Close	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
Ringmer Drive	54	4	7	3	75	1	25
Ringmer Road	44	8	18	7	87.5	1	12.5
Ryelands Drive	78	5	6	2	40	3	60
Shortgate Road	12	1	8	0	0	1	100

¹ Responses where no street name or an invalid address was given (x10) have been removed from the analysis but included in an Appendix.

² 7 respondents did not indicate whether they were in favour of a scheme or against a scheme so these have been removed from the analysis of this question.

³ Includes Moulsecoomb Way

Stonecross Road	51	13	25	8	61.5	5	38.5
Sullington Close	10	2	20	1	50	1	50
Westergate Road	17	3	18	2	67	1	33
Total	1178	208	18	163	78	45	22

NB: Response rates in some streets have been poor, in particular Ringmer Close 0%, Ryelands Drive at 6%, Ringmer Drive at 7%, Shortgate Road at 8%.

South Moulsecomb	No. properties mailed	No. responses received	Response rate %	Yes		No	
				No.	%	No.	%
Beech Grove	15	4	27	0	0	4	100
Bevendean Crescent	176	53	30	29	55	24	45
Birdham Road	161	15	9	9	60	6	40
Broadfields	24	2	8	2	100	0	0
Colbourne Avenue	57	17	30	11	65	6	35
Goodwood Way	76	8	10.5	5	62.5	3	37.5
Highbrook Close	60	10	17	7	70	3	30
Highway Close	12	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hillside	132	23	17	15	65	8	35
Hillside Way	10	2	20	0	0	2	100
Hodshrove Road	133	24	18	12	50	12	50
Home Farm Road	6	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medmerry Hill	52	10	19	5	50	5	50
Nyetimber Hill	29	4	14	1	25	3	75
Selba Drive	26	5	19	3	60	2	40
Selsfield Drive	138	16	11.5	12	62.5	4	37.5
Staplefield Drive	120	18	15	14	78	4	22
The Crescent	82	8	10	3	37.5	5	62.5
The Highway	72	8	11	3	37.5	5	62.5
Thorndean Road	92	19	21	16	84	3	16
Wheatfield Way	26	10	38	6	60	4	40
Widdicombe Way	105	20	19	11	50	9	50
Wild Park Close	20	1	5	1	100	0	0
Total	1624	277	17	165	60	112	40

A low response rate was received from Highway Close and Home Farm Road 0% and Wild Park Close 5%.

There was also 1 response from the 7 properties mailed in Lewes Road. This respondent was not 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.

	No. responses	% responses
Resident	483	96
Business owner or manager	26	5
Work in the area	25	5

Do you support the introduction of a Match and Event Day parking scheme?	Yes		No		Total
	No.	%	No.	%	
Residents	327	68	151	32	478
Business Owner or Managers	14	56	11	44	25

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	101	0	21
1	218	218	45
2	123	246	25
3	32	96	7
4 or more	10	40+	2
Total	484	600+	100

484 respondents have at least 600 vehicles.

Q4b How many vehicles are directly associated with your business?

No. of vehicles	No. responses	Total No. vehicles	%
0	0	0	0
1	15	15	63
2	2	4	8
3	1	3	4
4 or more	6	24+	25
Total	24	46	100

24 respondents had at least 46 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
Scheme is not needed or not needed for the whole of Moulsecoomb	49
Concerns that the scheme will become a charging scheme in future	32
Concerns about enforcement of scheme	26
Concerns about paying for visitors	19
More parking should have been provided by the stadium/ this should have been thought through at the planning stage	19
Student Parking is a problem	9
Concerns about access for emergency vehicles and/ or buses	7
Concerns that people will sell visitor permits	5
Signs need to be clear to inform visitors and carers	4
Waste of money	4
This scheme will cause displacement parking elsewhere	3
What will penalties be for parking without permits?	2
Don't want restrictions all day and night	1
I want a full scheme	1

Demographic Information

Gender

Gender	No.	%
Male	207	41
Female	217	43
Prefer not to say/ no reply	81	16
Total	505	100

Age

Age	No.	%
18-24	15	3
25-34	36	7
35-44	59	12
45-54	82	16
55-64	80	16
65-74	55	11
75+	39	8
Prefer not to say/ no reply	139	28

Total	505	100
--------------	------------	------------

Disability

Disability	No.	%
Yes	132	26
No	256	51
Prefer not to say/ no reply	117	23
Total	505	100

Ethnicity

Ethnicity		No.	%
White	English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	405	80.2
	Irish	9	1.8
	Gypsy	0	0
	Traveller	1	0.2
	Polish	2	0.4
	Portuguese	0	0
	Any other white background	9	1.8
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	0	0
	Indian	3	0.6
	Pakistani	1	0.2
	Chinese	2	0.4
	Any other Asian background	1	0.2
Black or Black British	African	3	0.6
	Caribbean	0	0
	Sudanese	0	0
	Any other black background	0	0
Mixed	Asian & White	3	0.6
	Asian & Black African	0	0
	Asian & Black Caribbean	0	0
	White & Black African	0	0
	White & Black Caribbean	2	0.4
	Any other mixed background	0	0
Other ethnic group	Turkish	2	0.4
	Arab	1	0.2
	Japanese	0	0
	Other ethnic group	3	0.6
Prefer not to say/ no reply		58	11.5
Total		505	100

Ten invalid responses were received.

Four 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 6 were received through the consultation portal and either no address given or addresses from outside the consultation area.

One of these came online responses came from The Surgery – 1 The Avenue, which is technically outside the consultation area but they say:

“We are a busy GP surgery with a patient list size of approx 6,800 and falls inside the proposed boundary area Patients and staff need to be able to park close to the surgery and not all are resident in the proposed boundary area Doctors would need permits”

Of these ten invalid responses:

5 were in favour

4 were against

1 person did not make a decision one way or the other.