

APPENDIX A

Area P Hove Park Review

Background

A resident parking scheme was implemented in the Hove Park Area (Area P) in September 2019. It was agreed in the parking priority timetable set in 2019 that a review be carried out in 2020.

Headline Findings

- 63.8% of respondents are satisfied or very satisfied with the current Area P parking scheme.
- 65.7% of respondents are happy for the scheme to remain the same?
- 17.4% of respondents want Saturday and Sunday to be included in the scheme's days of operation
- 9.0% of respondents want the scheme changed to a full scheme

Methodology

In December 2020, the council wrote to 1308 property addresses within the boundaries of the Hove Park residents parking area (Area P). Respondents were invited to complete the survey online via the council's Consultation Portal: Citizen Space or. Paper copies of the questionnaire and a prepaid reply envelope were also available on request. 314 (97.5%) responses were received online and 8 (2.5%) by mail. The consultation ran from 2 December 2020 to 15 January 2021.

Results

322 valid responses¹ were received from within the scheme boundary giving a response rate of 24.6%. People were asked how satisfied they are with the current Area P parking scheme?

	Number	%
Very Satisfied	125	38.9
Satisfied	80	24.9
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	30	9.3
Dissatisfied	41	12.8
Very dissatisfied	45	14.0
Total	321	100

¹ 150 responses were removed from the analysis for the following reasons: 5 gave incomplete address details, 122 from outside the area (mainly neighbouring roads and 8 from Park House, 35 Old Shoreham Road) and 23 duplicate responses.

People were then asked if they were happy for the scheme to remain the same:

	Number	%
Yes	211	65.7
No	110	34.3
Total	322	100

And whether they wanted the scheme to include Saturday and Sunday?

	Number	%
Yes	56	17.4
No	265	82.6
Total	321	100

And also if they wanted to be considered for a full parking scheme (Monday to Sunday 9am to 8pm)


	Number	%
Yes	29	9.0
No	293	91.0
Total	322	100

How satisfied are you with the Hove Park Area residents parking scheme. Replies by street are as follows:

	Number of properties mailed	Response rate (%)	Satisfied or very satisfied		Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied		Dissatisfied or very dissatisfied	
			Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Ash Close	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barrowfield Close	6	16.7	1	100	0	0	0	0
Barrowfield Drive	20	25.0	5	100	0	0	0	0
Bennett Avenue	5	20.0	0	0	0	0	1	100
Bennett Drive	71	48.1	24	70.6	3	8.8	7	20.6
Bishops Road	42	23.8	10	100	0	0	0	0
Chalfont Drive	27	22.2	3	50	1	16.7	2	33.3
Deanway	17	17.6	1	33.3	0	0	2	66.7
Downside	25	28.0	1	14.3	2	28.6	4	57.1
Dyke Road	73	8.2	3	50.0	1	16.7	2	33.3
Elm Close	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

	Number of properties mailed	Response rate (%)	Satisfied or very satisfied		Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied		Dissatisfied or very dissatisfied	
			Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
Elrington Road	15	26.7	4	100	0	0	0	0
Greyfriars Close	13	7.7	0	0	1	100	0	0
Hill Brow	66	21.2	8	57.1	2	14.3	4	28.6
Hill Drive	55	21.8	6	50.0	2	16.7	4	33.3
Hove Park Gardens	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hove Park Road	71	31.1	9	40.9	4	28.2	9	40.9
Hove Park Way	46	23.9	9	81.8	1	9.1	1	9.1
Kelly Road	6	33.3	1	50.0	0	0	1	50.0
Lloyd Close	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lloyd Road	30	16.7	4	80.0	0	0	1	20.0
Mallory Road	40	37.5	15	100.0	0	0	0	0
Meadow Close	21	19.0	1	25.0	0	0	3	75.0
Old Shoreham Road	12	16.7	1	50.0	0	0	1	50.0
Onslow Road	22	40.1	9	100.0	0	0	0	0
Orpen Road	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Radinden Drive	10	10.0	0	0	1	100.0	0	0
Radinden Manor Drive	22	27.3	3	50.0	2	33.3	1	16.7
Rigden Road	23	17.4	2	50.0	1	25.0	1	25.0
Shirley Avenue	11	18.2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0
Shirley Drive	152	29.6	16	35.6	4	8.9	25	55.6
Shirley Road	19	36.8	4	57.1	1	14.3	2	28.6
Stanford Close	9	22.2	1	50.0	1	50.0	0	0
The Droveaway	73	27.4	19	95.0	0	0	1	5.0
The Green	9	22.2	2	100.0	0	0	0	0
The Paddock	11	9.1	1	100.0	0	0	0	0
The Upper Drive	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tongdean Avenue	58	24.1	12	85.7	0	0	2	14.3
Tongdean Road	56	26.8	3	20.0	2	13.3	10	66.7
Tredcroft Road	35	20.0	7	100.0	0	0	0	0
Woodlands	28	28.6	7	87.5	0	0	1	12.5
Woodruff Avenue	60	23.3	12	85.7	0	0	2	14.3
Total	1308	24.5	205	63.8	30	9.3	86	26.5

Q1 Please indicate your satisfaction with the current Area P parking scheme




People were asked if they were happy for the scheme to remain the same? Replies by street are as follows:

Street	Yes		No	
	Number	%	Number	%
Ash Close	0	0	0	0
Barrowfield Close	1	100.0	0	0
Barrowfield Drive	4	80.0	1	20.0
Bennett Avenue	0	0	1	100.0
Bennett Drive	27	79.4	7	20.6
Bishops Road	10	100.0	0	0
Chalfont Drive	4	66.7	2	33.3
Deanway	1	33.3	2	66.7
Downside	2	28.6	5	71.4
Dyke Road	3	50.0	3	50.0
Elm Close	0	0	0	0
Elrington Road	4	100.0	0	0
Greyfriars Close	1	100.0	0	0
Hill Brow	9	60.0	6	40.0
Hill Drive	7	58.3	5	41.7
Hove Park Gardens	0	0	0	0
Hove Park Road	9	40.9	13	59.1
Hove Park Way	9	81.8	2	18.2
Kelly Road	0	0	2	100.0
Lloyd Close	0	0	0	0
Lloyd Road	3	60.0	2	40.0
Mallory Road	15	100.0	0	0
Meadow Close	1	25.0	3	75.0
Old Shoreham Road	1	100.0	0	0
Onslow Road	9	100.0	0	0
Orpen Road	0	0	0	0
Radinden Drive	1	100.0	0	0
Radinden Manor Drive	3	50.0	3	50.0
Rigden Road	2	66.7	1	33.3

Street	Yes		No	
	Number	%	Number	%
Shirley Avenue	1	50.0	1	50.0
Shirley Drive	16	35.6	29	64.4
Shirley Road	5	71.4	2	28.6
Stanford Close	2	100.0	0	0
The Droveaway	19	95.0	1	5.0
The Green	2	100.0	0	0
The Paddock	1	100.0	0	0
The Upper Drive	0	0	0	0
Tongdean Avenue	12	85.7	2	14.3
Tongdean Road	4	26.7	11	73.3
Tredcroft Road	5	71.4	2	28.6
Woodlands	6	75.0	2	25.0
Woodruff Avenue	12	85.7	2	14.3
Total	211	65.7	110	34.3

Q2 Are you happy for the scheme to remain the same?



Respondents could make comments on what is going well, what is not going well and also general comments about the scheme:

What is going well?	Number of times mentioned
It's stopped long term/ commuter parking	127
There's more spaces for residents	38
Nothing is going well	31
It's made the area safer	31
It stops vehicles blocking drives	26
Traffic flow is improved	25
Scheme works well	22
Pavements/ verges are clear	20
Levels of enforcement are good	17
Access to Hove Park/ Hove Rec is maintained/ improved by the scheme	6
Good that it's free at the weekend	4
What is not going so well	No. of times mentioned
It's dangerous: increased accidents/ bad sight lines/ double yellow lines at junctions are too short/ parking bays on bends	81
Shirley Drive is dangerous/ bays on beds/ sight lines/ congestion	59
Volume/ speed of traffic has increased	40
Scheme not needed/ money making exercise	32
Should be able to park across driveways	24
Access to and from driveways is difficult/ restricted views/ width of road/ double yellow lines too short	23
Scheme has caused displacement parking/ restricted views/ buses can't get through/ commuters are parking here (Woodland Drive)	22
Scheme doesn't stop evening and weekend parking	15
Want different hours	12
Displacement to Goldstone Crescent is dangerous	11
More enforcement needed	11
Difficult to drop children at school/ causes congestion around schools and nursery	8
Don't want to pay for visitors' permits	7
Want Pay & Display for visitors	7
Buying permits/ visitors' permits aren't easy (esp during COVID)	6
Include Woodland Avenue in the scheme	6
Don't want to pay for parking	3
There's more parking on verges / esp traders	3
Not enough visitor permits	2
Do you have any other suggested changes or comments?	No. of times mentioned
Woodland Drive needs to be in the scheme	7
Don't extend the scheme	3
Review needs to be done when people are at work - not during a pandemic	2

Include Goldstone Crescent in scheme	2
Want Car Club bays	1
Want Electric Vehicle charging points	1
Include Woodland Avenue in the scheme	1

Demographic Information

Age	Number	%
U18	0	0
18-24	0	0
25-34	1	0.5
35-44	22	10.2
45-54	52	24.2
55-64	47	21.9
65-74	47	21.9
75+	46	21.4
Total	221	100

What gender are you?	Number	%
Male	142	52.6
Female	128	47.4
Non-Binary	0	0
Other	0	0
Total	270	100

Do you identify as the gender you were assigned at birth?	Number	%
Yes	263	100
No	0	0
Total	263	100

Disability	Number	%
Yes, a little	18	6.8
Yes, a lot	17	6.5
No	228	86.7
Total	263	100

Of those who answered “yes”, disabilities were as follows:

Please state the type of impairment which applies to you.	Number
Physical impairment	24
Sensory impairment	0
Learning disability/ difficulty	0
Long-standing illness	12
Mental health condition	2
Development condition	0
Autistic Spectrum	0
Other	4

How would you describe your ethnic background?		Number	%
White	White English/ Welsh/ Scottish/ Northern Irish/ British	221	86.7
	Irish	3	1.2
	Gypsy or Irish Traveller	0	0
	Any other white background	19	7.5
Asian or Asian British	Bangladeshi	0	0
	Indian	0	0
	Pakistani	2	0.8
	Chinese	1	0.4
	Any other Asian background	1	0.4
Black or Black British	African	0	0
	Caribbean	0	0
	Any other Black background	0	0
Mixed	Asian & White	4	1.6
	Black African & White	0	0
	Black Caribbean & White	0	0
	Any other mixed background	0	0
Any other ethnic group	Arab	1	0.4
	Any other ethnic group	3	1.2
Total		255	100

How would you describe your sexuality?	Number	%
Bisexual	5	2.2
Gay Man	4	1.8
Heterosexual/ straight	205	91.1
Lesbian/ Gay Woman	4	1.8
Other	7	3.1
Total	225	100

Religious Belief	Number	%
I have no particular religion or belief	84	36.5
Buddhist	1	0.4
Christian	120	52.2
Hindu	0	0
Jain	0	0
Jewish	4	1.7
Muslim	4	1.7
Pagan	0	0
Sikh	0	0
Agnostic	2	0.9
Atheist	9	3.8
Other	4	1.7
Other philosophical belief	2	0.9
Total	230	100

Are you a carer	Number	%
Yes	28	10.1
No	248	89.9
Total	276	100

If yes, do you care for a:	Number
Parent	13
Partner or Spouse	6
Child with special needs	4
Friend	0
Other family member	4
Other	4

Armed Forces	Yes		No	
	Number	%	Number	%
Are you currently serving in the UK armed forces?	236	100	0	0
Have you ever served in the UK armed forces?	13	5.7	216	94.3
Are you a member of a current or former serviceman or woman's immediate family/ household?	4	1.8	221	98.2

