

Appendix C - London Road Station North Residents Parking Scheme (Extension to Area J) Consultation Report November 2012

Background

In 2009 a leaflet and questionnaire, asking about support for a residents parking scheme for the area was sent to all properties in a large area to the north of Brighton covering Roundhill and roads to the south of the Fiveways junction bordered by Preston Road, Stanford Avenue and Ditchling Road. At this time, respondents for the whole area were not in favour but a section to the south of the proposed area bordered by Viaduct Road, Preston Road, Ditchling Rise and Ditchling Road were heavily in favour and so Area J was extended to cover this area.

Since then, the area to the North of London Road station and the Round Hill area have experienced parking pressures and the council has received requests to look at this area again to see whether support for a residents parking scheme has changed.

In September 2012 a leaflet and questionnaire giving details about proposals for a resident parking scheme was sent to all property addresses in the London Road Station North area. The Round Hill area was consulted at the same time but the two areas are being considered separately.

Headline Findings

The consultation achieved a 40% response rate.

56% of respondents were in favour of joining the Area J Parking Zone.

Methodology

Brighton and Hove City Council Land and Property Gazeteer was used to provide 1784 property addresses in the Round Hill Area of Brighton. An information leaflet, detailed maps, a questionnaire and a prepaid envelope for reply was sent to each address. Respondents were invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal should they wish to: 10% chose this method.

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

Stanford Avenue Methodist Church:

1.30 pm to 5.30 pm, Thursday 25 October

3.30 pm to 7.30 pm, Friday 26 October

There was also an unstaffed exhibition at Hove Town Hall, Norton Road from Monday 1 October, 2012 to Wednesday 31 October, 2012, 9am to 5pm. There are 16 streets in the proposed scheme area.

715 valid responses¹ were received giving a response rate of 40%.

Results

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

Yes		No		Total
No.	%	No.	%	
394	56	312	44	706

Results on a street by street basis were as follows:

Street	No. properties mailed	No. responses	Response rate %	Yes		No	
				No.	%	No.	%
Beaconsfield Parade	8	0	0	0	-	0	-
Beaconsfield Road	59	10	17	2	20	8	80
Ditchling Gardens	21	10	48	6	67	3	33
Ditchling Road	200	66	30	11	17	54	83
Edburton Avenue	90	56	55	19	35	35	65
Florence Place	2	0	0	0	-	0	-
Florence Road	178	80	45	65	81	15	19
Grantham Road	97	45	41	19	42	26	58
Preston Road	14	0	0	0	-	0	-
Rugby Road	113	75	66	60	80	15	20
Semley Road	19	8	42	0	0	8	100
Southdown Avenue	79	53	67	30	59	22	41
Southdown Road	1	0	0	0	0	1	100
Springfield Road	421	172	41	149	88	21	12
St Andrews Road	20	10	50	4	44	5	56
Stanford Avenue	337	88	26	20	23	67	77
Wellend Villas, Springfield Road ³	124	41	33	9	22	32	78
Total	1784	715	40	394	56	312	44

¹ 18 Responses: from outside the area (x17) or where no street name was given (x1) have been removed from the analysis but included in an Appendix.

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

³ Wellend Villas has been separated out from Springfield Road. It is a car-free development and residents are ineligible for residents permits.

The overall results for each road without Wellend Villas (a car free development) are presented below, again with the overall totals in bold.

	Yes		No	
	Number	%	Number	%
Beaconsfield Parade	0	-	0	-
Beaconsfield Road	2	20	8	80
Ditchling Gardens	6	67	3	33
Ditchling Road	11	17	54	83
Edburton Avenue	19	35	35	65
Florence Place	0	-	0	-
Florence Road	65	81	15	19
Grantham Road	19	42	26	58
Preston Road	0	-	0	-
Rugby Road	60	80	15	20
Semley Road	0	0	8	100
Southdown Avenue	30	59	22	41
Southdown Road	0	0	1	100
Springfield Road	149	88	21	12
St Andrews Road	4	44	5	56
Stanford Avenue	20	23	67	77
Total	385	58	280	42

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	% respondents
Resident	683	95.5
Business owner or manager	46	6.5
Work in the area	47	6.6

Q3a How many cars in your household?

No. of cars	No. responses	Total No cars	% respondents
0	9	0	15
1	413	413	69.5
2	156	312	26
3	15	45	2.5
4 or more	1	4	0
Total	594	774	100

594 respondents have at least 774 vehicles (= 1.3 vehicles per household).

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

Yes		No		Total
No.	%	No.	%	
98	14.5	579	85.5	677

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

What type of business?	No. responses	% responses
Retail outlet	4	7
Office-based	19	34
Other, includes 9 working from home, 3 nurseries, 2 schools, 2 gardeners, 2 doctors surgeries, 2 dental surgeries, 2 therapists	33	59
Total responses	56	100

Q4b How many vehicles are directly associated with your business?

No. of vehicles	No. responses	Total No. vehicles	% Respondents
0	2	0	3.5
1	25	25	45
2	14	28	25
3	2	6	3.5
4 or more	13	52	23
Total	56	111	100

56 respondents had at least 111 vehicles associated with their business (= 2.0 vehicles per business).

Q5 Any other comments?

An open text box enabled respondents to add comments. Although expressed in residents' own words, analysis of the open text shows common themes emerged and have been grouped as follows:

Comments	No. of times made
No need for a scheme	76
Don't want to pay to park / it is too expensive	64
Concerns about displacement	42
This is a money making exercise	40
In favour because of current parking difficulties/ general positive comments	21
Want a light touch scheme (2 hours a day)	20
Not enough residents parking spaces in the scheme	19
Needs enforcement of current illegal parking	17
Concerns about the costs of visitors parking	17
Scheme won't help the parking situation after 8 pm	12
Don't want signs and P&D machines in a conservation area	10
Where will Wellend Villas residents be able to park	10
Unhappy about hours of operation	8
General negative comments	4
Don't want more double yellow lines or double yellow lines across driveways	2
Not enough visitor permits	2

Demographic Information

Gender

Gender	No.	%
Male	268	37.5
Female	290	40.5
Prefer not to say/ no reply	157	22
Total	715	100

Age

Age	No.	%
18-24	6	1
25-34	79	11
35-44	112	15.5
45-54	113	15.5
55-64	90	12.5
65-74	48	7
75+	29	4
Prefer not to say/ no reply	238	33
Total	715	100⁴

Disability

Disability	No.	%
Yes	65	9
No	450	63
Prefer not to say/ no reply	200	28
Total	715	100

⁴ Does not add up to 100 due to rounding

Ethnicity

Ethnicity		No.	%
White	English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	498	70
	Irish	7	1
	Gypsy	1	0.1
	Traveller	0	0
	Polish	0	0
	Portuguese	0	0
	Any other white background	36	5
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	0	0
	Indian	3	0.4
	Pakistani	1	0.1
	Chinese	1	0.1
	Any other Asian background	2	0.3
Black or Black British	African	0	0
	Caribbean	1	0.1
	Sudanese	0	0
	Any other black background	1	0.1
Mixed	Asian & White	3	0.4
	Asian & Black African	0	0
	Asian & Black Caribbean	0	0
	White & Black African	0	0
	White & Black Caribbean	0	0
	Any other mixed background	1	0.1
	Other ethnic group	Turkish	1
Arab		1	0.1
Japanese		1	0.1
Other ethnic group		0	0
Prefer not to say/ no reply		157	22
Total		715	100

Responses received with no street details given:

One response was received with no street names given so it is difficult to know whether this is from within the consultation area. This response was received online via the consultation portal and the respondent was not in favour of the proposed scheme.

Responses received from outside the area:

16 responses were received from people living outside the consultation area. All of these were received online:

4 of these respondents were in favour of the scheme but 13 were against. 14 of these people made long comments:

“The proposed boundary ends on the north side of Stanford Avenue. We live in the street immediately adjoining the boundary - Southdown Place - which extends into Southdown Road. There are houses on one side of the street only, as Blakers Park is on the other - which means there has always been plenty of parking available to residents of Southdown Place and Southdown Road. However - the cul de sac end of Southdown Place has been plagued for years by inconsiderate drivers who park on the pavement so that they are right next to their houses, rather than parking 10 yards further away on the road. If residents parking controls come into the area, more cars will be forced to park in Southdown Road, and the pavement parking on Southdown Place will get worse. The cul de sac is narrow; the road is only wide enough for one car to pass and it only has pavement on one side. When drivers park on the pavement (as they do every day) pedestrians are forced to walk in the road. The vehicles also create an obstacle in the road, narrowing it further, so that larger vehicles cannot get through. They also park close to the corner, making turning into the close very difficult. Yellow lines need to be put in place as soon as possible on this stretch of Southdown Place to prevent the pavement parking, and to make the pavement safe and accessible for pedestrians”

“We understand that there is a real issue with parking just north of London Road station that must be addressed. However, as with the previous scheme introduced south of the station this will create the same problems just outside this new proposed zone. The area south of the station is not widely used due to the scheme and that is the issue that should be addressed rather than pushing the problem onto somebody else's doorstep, potentially causing a further extension to the scheme in 12 months time. We have 2 cars as both my wife and myself work outside the city, my wife requires use of a car as she is an Environment Agency field officer, and I work in an area with poor public transport links to the city so we have no viable alternative. I would also consider 8pm as being too late for the scheme to operate, being a local resident working outside the city I am often home between 1830 and 2000 and parking is already an issue on our road

without additional problems caused by the extension to the London road scheme creating extra pressure on the few spaces available.”

“When the Council considers parking schemes outside the City centre, the parameters are very different. In the City centre, the Council is trying to regulate the the traffic caused by residents wanting to park near their home and visitors to the shops and beach etc. The problems in this area apply during the working day, weekday evenings and at weekends. In the area of Preston Park and North of London Road Station, the requirements are different. Here the regulation is required to allow people to park near their homes, while trying to deter those who use the streets effectively as a Park and Ride scheme, whereby they drive in from outlying areas to where buses are cheaper (Centre Fare zone and Short Hop) and more frequent (a number 5 every 5 minutes at the bottom of Beaconsfield Villas. These problems occur generally during the working day and in the evenings, with less problem at weekends. In my road, Osborne Road, not covered by the proposal but will suffer as a knock on effect, the real problem is after 6p.m. on any night. This seems to be about the time when parking restrictions finish. If I am home from work after about 6p.m., it is virtually impossible to find a parking place. So, any scheme that finishes at 8p.m. is not going to resolve the problem. We need a scheme that restricts parking until midnight. Only then will have any chance of finding a place. I think that this issue of when parking becomes unrestricted will affect the residents of North of London Road Station too, and should be considered in the proposal.”

“You are deliberately punishing residents in areas that have opted out of your previous schemes by forcing an outward migration of parking rather than offering viable alternatives. Anybody that voluntarily supports a residents parking scheme should be prevented from parking in any other street (outside their zone) in the UK. After all, that is what schemes like this hold for the future and it'll make them wake up and smell the coffee a little sooner.”

“The Church in Stanford Ave, is used by various organisations everyday. All of which travel there by car mainly, because they live outside of the area. Our Scout Group as an example, has 5 Leaders who arrive at various times from 4.00pm to 9.00pm to run the various sections. We have some 60 children aged from 6 to 14yrs attending weekly, the majority not living in the proposed area. Some of their parents help with meetings and therefore also need to be able to park. Each day there are organisations on the Church premises as well as the regular Church services, Weddings and Funerals also need to be accommodated, as that is really not a problem that people need at that time, has anyone taken the time to look at the issues of the local community with regard to regular users of halls, churches etc. surely it should be a priority as the children, elderly etc would otherwise not be attending these activities as parking reasonably close to pick up and drop of is one of the things stressed so that no one needs to walk around alone either in the daytime and especially the evening? The proposed parking scheme would certainly price Scouting out, along with Lunch Club for the elderly, mother and toddler groups, Girls Brigade, and the Church congregation would diminish, as we could not afford to be paying on average £5 per week just to park the car, for each of us ie a total of about £25 per week? Who's prepared to pay that for being a noble volunteer running these organisations? Please think again with this proposal, there are more againsts than fors in lots of ways. The parking around

Stanford Avenue/Southdown Ave is really being looked at for no good reason other than the various other proposals which are sending cars from other areas into ours. The cost is the ultimate reason for that because no one is guaranteed a parking space outside their house, there are supposedly only 8 parking spaces for every 22 cars permits issued, therefore implementing this proposal will not solve any problems but just move it around and just completely shutdown our Church and its organisations. JUST LEAVE IT AS IT IS PLEASE! THANK YOU.”

“The areas north of London road station have ample street parking and there is absolutely no need to introduce parking permits; we are more than 2 miles away from the town center !! It really smacks of revenue generation for the council at the expense of local people going about their business. There are parks, clubs, schools etc which require people to be able to come and go at will without the need to be charged for parking as there is always ample parking for all. The Church on Stanford ave Methodist church hosts many social groups and functions with people travelling from local areas and they need to park close to such amenities. Most of these functions are completely voluntary and a great asset to the local social fabric of the area such as scouts, cubs guides etc. Introducing parking fees and permits would significantly impact the viability of such groups and would place them under excessive financial pressure.”

“I work at Downs Infant School as a teaching assistant, and commute daily from my home in Keymer Road, Hollingbury by car as this is the cheapest form of transport and allows me to pop home at lunchtime and drop off and collect my children from college on the way. Although there is a staff car park, spaces are very limited and by the time I get to work they are usually taken by the teachers who get in earlier. I usually park in Florence or Rugby Road about 8.30 and have left the area by 3.30. This does not impact upon the residents who return home from work later, or during any of the school holidays or at weekends. I am on a low income and receive working tax and child tax credit. After all my outgoings I have £73 per week to spend on food and petrol. If I have to pay out £25 a week in parking (and it will be much the same amount for a bus ticket and much less convenient) it will literally be impossible to manage each week. There are two schools in the proposed area (Downs Infants and Downs Junior School). There is limited parking at the Infants and none at the Juniors. Could you not consider a permit for the staff, which would only cover the hours say 8-4 and only in term time? The council would still make money, the school staff (council employees) could get to work and not spend all their wages on parking (and looking at the scheme most of the area around these schools is permit only and not even pay and display), and it wouldn't affect the residents in the evenings, weekends and school holidays. This seems to me a sensible suggestion and one I would ask you to give serious consideration to. Otherwise long-term staff like myself will have to look for another job and leave the one we love because we can't afford to get to work.”

“Beaconsfield Villas is already at Capacity, when my wife arrives home from work any later than 1800 – 1900 it is almost impossible to park, recently she arrived late from a meeting at 2230 and had a ten minute work walk from the car park space she found after searching for another 10 mins, she was forced to walk the streets in the dark. I have noticed many vehicles and vans that are either left for weeks sometimes months at a time. Further more there are also multiply works

vans belonging to one household or another, again, left for days when not in use. I think 0900 to 2000 restrictions would be over excessive, however, perhaps a 1100 to 1300 or if needs be a 0900 to 1800 should be tried just to rid us of unused vehicles. If the parking scheme is rolled out on Springfield rd etc my road will be unusable to residents. Thanks for your time. Kind regards M. Boote
mattboote@yahoo.co.uk 07810653201”

“There is a problem where I live from double parking which causes hazard and inconvenience when I ride my bike. I hope an extension of this scheme will sort it out. There should be NO PARKING in Stanford Avenue in front of the Methodist Church at the junction with Stanford Avenue. There is a pedestrian crossing there and visibility is impaired. There was a serious pedestrian & cyclist accident there in January 2012. Similarly, the parking in Stanford Avenue either side of the junction with Cleveland Road should be removed as it makes it difficult to see pedestrians and vehicles. Vehicles go much too fast in Stanford Avenue. The speed limit should be reduced.”

“I do not live within the proposed parking zone but I will be seriously affected if it goes ahead because the scheme will displace vehicles into my road. The previous 2009 scheme has already displaced many vehicles from south of the railway line to the north; this is evident from the number of empty parking spaces south of the railway and congested parking to the north. The scheme has not solved parking problems in the area but has made the parking problem larger. The way forward is to remove the 2009 scheme and thus reduce the size of the parking problem. The 2009 scheme went ahead despite the majority of residents being against the scheme; the decision to go ahead was flawed. I previously objected to the 2009 proposals because of concerns that it would result in displaced parking. My concerns have been fully realised. My views were dismissed because I did not live within the proposed parking zone. The decision to exclude comments from all affected residents was unjust. The previous consolation leaflet mentioned that double yellow lines might be introduced if the scheme did not go ahead. This solution should be tried before extending the parking zone. I did not receive a leaflet about the current proposals, presumably because I do not live within the proposed parking zone. However, as mentioned above, I will be affected by displaced parking if it goes ahead. I consider all affected residents should be leafleted and be able to influence any future decisions. The leaflet states that the new scheme might mean more cars parking in the areas just outside the zone. This statement is misleading as the evidence following the introduction of similar schemes demonstrates that the new scheme will lead to more displaced parking. Two other new parking zones have also caused more parking problems in my area due to displaced parking: parking restrictions along Preston Park Avenue and within Preston Park itself. Little parking now takes place in these restricted areas to the disadvantage of nearby residents. I consider that a thorough review of the last three schemes should be undertaken before any decision is made to proceed with the current proposals. I also consider that there should be no further expansion of parking zones within the city until the current citywide parking review has been completed.”

“Displacement as other schemes have shown, implementing a parking scheme simply shifts the problem elsewhere. Cars which don't fit in the new parking zone (which will have fewer spaces than a non-controlled zone) will have to elsewhere

ie to streets bordering the zone to the north, which will displace cars from there further north and so it goes on. Either the city becomes entirely parking controlled, or it becomes a city of two halves where some can pay and get a parking space while others in more outlying and often cheaper areas get all the overflow cars clogging up their roads, while not being able to use their own cars to get nearer to town. There is no natural boundary at Fiveways, and cars will simply shift further up the hill, meaning that those of us in Hollingdean, who do not currently experience particular difficulties with parking, will now have to endure the parking issues of other areas closer to town, without the luxury of being able to do without a car, as we live too far away from town to be able to do without one, unlike those whose areas have already been converted to controlled parking. The proposal also raises the issue of what will happen to second cars from the proposed parking area. No permits for those cars will be issued in the first instance. Where will these cars go? - to just outside the zone shifting the problem but not solving it. If parking control is then (in a couple of years) suggested for those of us in Hollingdean, what do we do with our second, often used, car. Where will we be able to park it? Patcham? Where will we be left? As a parent, with three children, living at the top of a steep hill, I need my car to go about my daily business. Taking the bus as a family costs over £10, while there is no way I can get children to various activities/commitments nor do shopping for five people on the bus or on bikes. Parking zones in central areas sort of makes sense. Putting them in more suburban areas which have to by necessity, be more car dependent than central areas seems like an extra tax on those who already have to live further away from town/work because they can't afford the high house prices of more central areas. Controlled parking is not a one-size-fits-all solution to parking problems. It is a very unsophisticated response to the issues that residents of the area have raised. Saying that consistency is a good reason for implementing the scheme shows that local solutions are not being actively sought, which is poor service from the council. Why is there no option of a soft touch scheme whereby commuter parking can be prevented by having to pay for an hours parking during the day, but at other times it is free? I cannot see why this would not solve the biggest issue raised of commuters parking all day in the area. There are a huge number of schools, nurseries, pre-schools, after school activities held in the area, which are often used by parents picking their children up by car. From looking at the map, there is no provision for parents to be able to park for 15-30mins for free to drop off or collect their children; indeed there are very, very few parking spaces in the areas that are not solely for residents. What will these parents do? I think a whole list of unintended consequences will come into play, including teachers/caregivers not being able to speak to parents who have to rush back to their illegally parked cars, and an increase in double/unsafe parking. This may not be immediately quantifiable but will impact negatively on many people's quality of lives. Lastly, why was this consultation not more widely known about? As someone living outside it, but nearby, who uses the area daily, I have seen no leaflets/posters at all about it. Nothing from the council-run schools whose users will be affected. A cynic might conclude that wider consultation is not sought because it would be unsympathetic to the review. In addition, the map quality was really poor, which does not help clarity and dissuades people from making informed comments."

"The parking scheme takes no account of the schools and many clubs and children's activities that take part in the area. quite excluding cost, the minimal

number of paid parking spaces will not cater for the requirements. I have already served notice on my child's after school club that if the scheme is approved we will remove our child. We are already teetering on a financial precipice and the additional costs that the parking and probable fines (due to lack of usable spaces) may tip us over. Unfortunately we are not rich enough to live near to our children's school so we live in hollingdean nearly a mile from school. We are not able to fit in our children's after school activities and work with the 15 minutes walk each way for every activity. Our children will have to give up gym, yoga, cubs, beavers, football, eco club - still they will get to watch more TV. Please note the cost of buses and the torturous route (taking nearly 15 mins for each journey) preclude that as an option. I am also concerned about the displacement of cars out of the parking controlled into other areas. The parking control will significantly reduce the number of spaces available, and unfortunately people won't sell or scrap their cars - they will move them to non controlled areas. This will create problems in our area where we need to use cars due to the much greater distance for where we live to the location of facilities. I also object to paying tax to have my car on the road and a tax on parking it as well. If your intention is to prevent commuters driving into Brighton and parking in residential areas, or commuters parking near stations, why not use the policy that Worthing use - i.e. no non resident parking during and hour in the morning and an hour in the afternoon. I would suggest that this creative method does not provide the income stream that you obviously want to achieve. I also note that no attempt has been made to include Brighton residents in nearby areas, school catchments, or facility and service users in this consultation. I see no links on the council website homepage and unless you hunt you can't find it. It would appear that the green council has slipped straight into the none democratic ways of there predecessors - what happened to your integrity. PS your link to the London road north survey takes me to the Round hill one - is this deliberate or incompetence? Is it grounds for a mis-consultation?"

"If implemented, permits should be provided to people who work in the area, this could be restricted to working days only. Currently, there are no issues with parking in the surrounding area."

"I am against the proposals to introduce parking restrictions as there have been previously no parking issues in this area although unsurprisingly there are more vehicles parking up here recently which is obviously due to the fact that they have moved up the road where there is free parking rather than pay charges. This is clearly a money making exercise generated mostly from the residents and the minimal amount of metered parking. All that will happen is that residents will park in the adjacent roads that are still free rather than buy a parking permit. Introducing parking restrictions does not solve parking issues but generates them as the 'problem' will then only move further up the road to an area that is free and then this will be perceived as an issue and restrictions will then be extended thus generating even more money from the poor unfortunate people needing to park their cars. Preston Park Avenue is a prime example of how the parking restrictions has failed as nobody parks there anymore but are now causing more parking congestion elsewhere. People should not feel as though they are being forced out of their cars as it is not always possible to use public transport. I work in Stanford Avenue and use my car to get to work every day - a 30 minute journey. There is no direct bus route from Peacehaven to here so it would mean a change at the Steine and even with the new bus lane between Telscombe Cliffs and

Rottingdean my journey via bus would take almost twice as long as it does by car. I also require my car for work related site visits and therefore cannot rely on using public transport to get to work. The cost of fuel and tax is already extremely high and to add on the cost of parking in a time when wages have been reduced and pay increases just do not happen is just too expensive. In short this is a very bad idea - the areas outside the parking restriction area will not be thanking you for increasing the amount of parked cars in their area...and where do you stop, the pattern emerging is that parking restrictions are being extended further and further to the outskirts of Brighton and it wouldn't surprise me at all if they didn't end up in the likes of Saltdean eventually!! I for one will be one of those people who rather than pay to use one of the few meter spaces will still drive to work but look to park in the free areas still available, of course until this becomes restricted as well!!!!"