

## Consultation report

### Introduction

The consultation period ran from 20 March to 29 May 2020.

There were 113 separate responses of which 106 were objections and 7 were in support.

Table 1: Numbers of responses by category of responder

	Object	Support	Total
Park users	95	7	102
Stanmer residents and residents' group	5	0	5
Stanmer business representatives	4	0	4
Dog watch group	1	0	1
BHCC officers	1	0	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>113</b>

Table 2: Self-identified descriptions in responses (where stated)

Dog walker	53
Family	13
BHCC resident	32
Pensioner	11

The majority of those who responded were individuals. Responses were received from the following organisations: Stanmer Village Residents' Committee; Disabled Ramblers; Brighton Dog Watch.

### Summary of comments and objections

Similar comments have been grouped together. A table showing responses in more detail is at Appendix 6.

#### **Objections to having to pay for parking at all:**

A quarter of people who responded felt that parking should be free at Stanmer Park. A similar proportion commented that the parking proposals would make it harder for people to access the countryside.

#### **Proposed charges are too high:**

About a quarter of people responded that they thought the proposed charges were too high. Various different suggestions were made such as periods of free parking from 1 to 4 hours or limited to a max stay of 4 hours and an annual permit.

### **Charging hours for Upper Lodges car park:**

One responder pointed out that the car park gate was closed at 5 pm for security reasons.

### **Too much parking in centre of park:**

There were a number of comments about too much parking in the centre of the park and that prices would need to be higher in the centre of the park at Patchway car park to put people off driving in to the centre.

### **More designated disabled spaces needed:**

It was pointed out that 6% of parking spaces provided should be designated disabled spaces and these were not shown on the plan for Upper Lodges and Chalk Hill car parks.

### **Improved bus services:**

A number of responses suggested that improvements should be made to bus services to the park.

## **Business responses**

Concerns raised by businesses which are located outside the proposed TRO area, regarding parking and access for volunteers, are being addressed separately. An objection from the leaseholder of Stanmer House has been responded to separately as it did not concern the proposed TRO.

## **Stanmer residents of The Courtyard and Stable Block**

These households each have 2 car spaces of private parking within the development. Some residents have asked that visitor permit and resident permit parking should be available to them as it is to other residents in the City.

## **Stanmer Village Residents' Committee**

The following letter was received from Jason Knight, Chair:

*On behalf of the residents of Stanmer Village, including Upper and Lower Lodges, The Stable Block and The Courtyard, The Stanmer Residents Committee would like the ETS Committee to note the following agreed points:*

- 1. We accept the necessity of introducing paid parking in Stanmer, and therefore the majority of residents support the goals of the TRO*
- 2. We would like formal acknowledgment that revenue raised in the park, will stay in the park, including revenue from parking payments and any parking fines*
- 3. We note the charges laid out in Schedule 2, page 14 of the order and would like clarification of the plans for the Church car park and Upper Lodges car park which are both mentioned there-in. We strongly support the improvement and upkeep of these two parking areas.*
- 4. In particular, we feel strongly the Church car park should be part of the parking provision to help discourage parking in the village and also better support customers to the Cafe, Fruit Factory and other village based businesses.*

5. We require clarification on how a Stanmer Village "Housing Parking" Scheme would work, as the villagers are supportive in principle of this suggestion from [council officers] and would like to know the ETS is also behind the idea. The SRC would welcome the ability to deal directly with the enforcers of such a scheme, exploring how we could register our cars and those of our guests and would welcome a meeting to take this further as soon as can be arranged (on Zoom if necessary).

6. We welcome the delay in closing the consultation and request confirmation that the TRO will not come into effect until a) all car parks are complete and open (including the church car park) and b) our points above have been fully resolved.

### **Disabled Ramblers**

The following response was received from Val Rawlings and Bob McLellan, Regional Representatives for Hampshire and Sussex:

*Thank you for sending this information and I'm sure it will improve the running of the park and make the parking much better. My only question is - will disabled have to pay for parking? I have no objection personally, but if we want to put a ramble on in the Park it will be useful to be able to tell those attending whether they have to pay the same as stated in the documents. Also, what is the timescale for the alterations? When do you hope it will all be completed?*

### **Brighton Dog Watch**

The group's response is at Appendix 7.

